

***The
Fundamentals
for Today***

BR
45
F82
V. 1

The Fundamentals for Today

COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES

Volume One

Jubilee Year Edition

*published under
the sponsorship of*

THE BIBLE INSTITUTE OF LOS ANGELES, INC.

CHARLES L. FEINBERG, *Editor*

KREGEL PUBLICATIONS

Grand Rapids 6, Michigan

1958

COPYRIGHT 1958
by the
BIBLE INSTITUTE OF LOS ANGELES, INC.

All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 58-13701

Printed in the United States of America

Foreword

During 1958 The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Inc., is celebrating its Jubilee Year. Since the school and its affiliates adhere to the time-honored position of the founders — a fact seldom duplicated in the history of our land — it is altogether fitting and appropriate that *The Fundamentals* be republished. This series first saw the light in 1909 through the generous gifts of Lyman and Milton Stewart. Distribution ran into the millions of copies.

A committee has been authorized to proceed with the task of publishing the volumes in cooperation with Kregel Publications of Grand Rapids. The committee consists of Dr. Charles L. Feinberg, Director and Professor of Semitics and Old Testament, Chairman; and Dr. James H. Christian, Professor of New Testament, Dr. Arnold D. Ehlert, Librarian and Associate Professor of Practical Theology, Dr. Glenn O'Neal, Professor of Practical Theology, and Dr. Gerald B. Stanton, Professor of Systematic Theology — all of Talbot Theological Seminary, a school affiliated with The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Inc.

A special word of appreciation is hereby given to Dr. Feinberg for the untold hours he has spent in the general oversight of the preparation of this edition and in revising and bringing up-to-date many of the articles which appeared in the first edition of *The Fundamentals*.

Thanks are tendered to Kregel Publications of Grand Rapids and the Talbot Seminary committee for the time given and the faithfulness shown to the task before them. It is the prayer of us all that the Lord of the Word may be glorified in this presentation of His truth for the people of God everywhere.

LOUIS T. TALBOT, *Chancellor*

SAMUEL H. SUTHERLAND, *President*

Los Angeles, California
May, 1958

Editor's Preface

The primary characteristic of the religious picture of our day is flux and change. Heartening, indeed, it is to know that in an age of confusion and instability, there are certain inalienable and inviolable truths upon which believers can stand. Small men hold opinions; big men are gripped by convictions. Of the latter class were the contributors to the original series of *The Fundamentals*, which began to appear in the first decade of this century.

The conditions of our day are strangely parallel to the times in which these classics were first penned. The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Inc., under whose sponsorship they first appeared, is happy to declare by the republication of the series that it maintains now the same doctrinal basis as a half century ago. That the series has met a vital need, and is valuable even now, can be substantiated many times over by the repeated references to *The Fundamentals* in current publications.

It is a happy privilege to tender thanks to the Board of Directors of The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Inc. — a company of Christian gentlemen who unselfishly, consistently, sacrificially, and quietly give of themselves that the work of God here shall go on unabated — under whose direction and approval the work has been carried on; to Kregel Publications for their splendid cooperation; and in a special sense to my esteemed colleagues of the Talbot Theological Seminary for their invaluable aid, without which this venture would have been impossible.

May the Triune God be eminently magnified in this presentation of truths surely believed among us.

CHARLES L. FEINBERG

Los Angeles, California
May, 1958

Contents

Foreword	5
Editor's Preface	7
1. The History of the Higher Higher Criticism —	<i>Canon Dyson Hague, M.A.</i> 13
✓ 2. The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch — <i>and</i> Three Peculiarities of the Pentateuch Incompatible with the Graf-Wellhausen Theories of its Composition —	<i>Prof. George F. Wright, D.D., LL.D.</i> 21 <i>Andrew C. Robinson, M.A.</i>
3. The Bible and Modern Criticism	<i>F. Bettex, D.D.</i> 27
✓ 4. The Holy Scriptures and Modern Negations —	<i>Prof. James Orr, D.D.</i> 33
5. Old Testament Criticism and New Testament Christianity —	<i>Prof. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.</i> 45
6. The Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament —	<i>William Caven, D.D., LL.D.</i> 57
7. The Internal Evidence of the Fourth Gospel —	<i>Excellent!</i> <i>Canon G. Osborne Troop, M.A.</i> 67
8. The Early Narratives of Genesis —	<i>Prof. James Orr, D.D.</i> 75
9. One Isaiah —	<i>Prof. George L. Robinson, D.D.</i> 81
10. The Book of Daniel —	<i>Prof. Joseph D. Wilson, D.D.</i> 89
11. The Doctrinal Value of the First Chapter of Genesis —	<i>Rev. Dyson Hague, M.A.</i> 95
12. The Testimony of Archaeology to the Scriptures — Being the chapter on "The Testimony of the Monuments to the Truth of the Scriptures" — <i>and</i> the chapter on "The Recent Testimony of Archaeology to the Scriptures" —	<i>Prof. George F. Wright, D.D.</i>109 <i>M. G. Kyle, D.D., LL.D.</i>
13. Science and Christian Faith —	<i>Rev. Prof. James Orr, D.D.</i>115
14. The Inspiration of the Bible — Definition, Extent and Proof —	<i>Rev. James M. Gray, D.D.</i>125

✓ 15.	Inspiration — <i>Exc.</i>	<i>L. W. Munhall, M.A., D.D.</i>	147
✓ 16.	The Moral Glory of Jesus Christ, A Proof of Inspiration —	<i>Rev. Wm. G. Moorehead, D.D.</i>	159
✓ 17.	The Testimony of the Scriptures to Themselves —	<i>Rev. Geo. S. Bishop, D.D.</i>	171
18.	Testimony of the Organic Unity of the Bible to Its Inspiration —	<i>Arthur T. Pierson</i>	177
✓ 19.	Fulfilled Prophecy a Potent <i>Exc.</i> Argument for the Bible —	<i>Arno C. Gaebelein</i>	185
✓ 20.	Life in the Word — <i>Excellent!</i>	<i>Philip Mauro</i>	191
✓ 21.	Is There a God? — <i>Exc.</i>	<i>Rev. Thomas Whitelaw,</i>	215
		<i>M.A., D.D.</i>	
22.	God in Christ the Only Revelation of the Fatherhood of God —	<i>Robert E. Speer</i>	225
23.	The Deity of Christ —	<i>Prof. Benjamin B. Warfield</i>	235
		<i>D.D., LL.D.</i>	
✓ 24.	The Virgin Birth of Christ —	<i>Rev. Prof. James Orr, D.D.</i>	241
25.	The God-Man — <i>Excellent</i>	<i>John Stock</i>	251
✓ 26.	The Certainty and Importance of the Bodily Resurrection of <i>Exc.</i> Jesus Christ from the Dead —	<i>Rev. R. A. Torrey, D.D.</i>	265
27.	The Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit —	<i>Rev. R. A. Torrey, D.D.</i>	281
28.	The Holy Spirit and The Sons of God —	<i>Rev. W. J. Erdman, D.D.</i>	287
29.	Christianity No Fable —	<i>Rev. Thomas Whitelaw,</i>	295
		<i>M.A., D.D.</i>	

*The
Fundamentals
for Today*

I

The History of the Higher Criticism

By Canon Dyson Hague, M.A.

Rector of The Memorial Church, London, Ontario
Lecturer in Liturgics and Ecclesiology, Wycliffe
College, Toronto, Canada

Revised by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

What is the meaning of the term "Higher Criticism"? At the outset it must be explained that the word "higher" is an academic term, used in this connection in a purely special or technical sense. It is used in contrast to "Lower Criticism." Higher criticism means nothing more than the study of the literary structure of the various books of the Bible. Such study is indispensable to ascertain the author, date, circumstances, and purpose of a writing.

Why Is Higher Criticism Identified with Unbelief?

It must be stated that there is a higher criticism which is reverent in tone and scholarly in work. But the work of the higher critic has not always been pursued in a reverent spirit nor in the spirit of scientific and Christian scholarship. In the first place, the leaders of this movement based their theories largely on their own subjective conclusions. They have based their conclusions largely on the very dubious basis of the author's style and supposed literary qualifications. Style is an unsafe basis for the determination of a literary work. Because a man is a linguistic expert does not insure that he is able to understand the integrity or credibility of a passage of Scripture any more than the beauty or spirit of it. The qualification for the perception of Biblical truth is spiritual insight.

In the second place, higher critical theories have been in the hands of those who go far in the realm of the conjectural. It

was Newton who warned that no regard whatever should be paid to the mere conjectures or hypotheses of thinkers. Thirdly, the dominant men of the movement were men with a strong bias against the supernatural. Some of the men who have been the most distinguished in the higher critical movement have been men who have no faith in the God of the Bible, and no faith in either the necessity or the possibility of a personal supernatural revelation. It is not our position that all higher critics were or are anti-supernaturalists, but the dominant figures have been and are. Sadly enough, the higher criticism has become identified with a system of criticism which is based on hypotheses and suppositions which have for their object the repudiation of the traditional theory, and has investigated the origins, forms, styles, and contents, apparently not to confirm the authenticity and credibility and reliability of the Scriptures, but to discredit in most cases their genuineness, to discover discrepancies, and throw doubt on their authority.

The Origin of the Movement

Who were the men whose views have moulded the thinking of the leading writers of the higher critical school today? Three stages in this development are discernible: (1) The French-Dutch; (2) the German; and (3) the British-American. The views which are now accepted as axiomatic seem to have been first hinted at by Carlstadt in 1521. The higher criticism may really be said to have originated with Spinoza, the rationalist Dutch philosopher. In 1670 he came out boldly and impugned the traditional date and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, ascribing the Pentateuch to Ezra or some other late compiler. In 1753 a French physician, Jean Astruc, reputedly a free-thinker of profligate character, set forth for the first time the Jehovistic and Elohistive divisive hypothesis, and opened a new era. He claimed that the use of the two names, Jehovah and Elohim, showed the Book of Genesis was composed of different documents. Astruc may be called the father of the documentary theories. He asserted there are traces of no less than ten or twelve different memoirs in the Book of Genesis. He denied its divine authority, and considered the book to be marred by useless repetitions, disorder, and contradiction.

Eichhorn published in 1780 his work on Old Testament introduction. He further developed the documentary theory of Astruc, and was followed by Vater and later by Hartmann. They ultimately made the Pentateuch a heap of fragments, joined together by an editor or redactor. In 1806 De Wette propounded the view that the Book of Deuteronomy was written in the age of Josiah (II Kings 22:8). Before long Vatke had unreservedly declared the post-Mosaic and post-prophetic origin of the first four books of the Bible. In succession came Bleek, Ewald, Hupfeld, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen with their respective views on the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

After the German stage of criticism came the British-American. Davidson, Robertson Smith, G. A. Smith, Driver, and Briggs followed the trail blazed by the German rationalistic writers. The list is admittedly a very partial one, but these are prominent names in connection with the movement.

The Views of the Critics

Three things can certainly be asserted of nearly all, if not all, of the leaders. They denied the validity of miracle and any miraculous narrative. Miracles were considered legendary or mythical. They denied the reality of prophecy. Prophecy was called conjectures or coincidences, if not imposture. They denied the reality of revelation; they were avowed unbelievers of the supernatural. The religion of the Old Testament was simply a human religion. The formative forces of the higher critical movement, then, were rationalistic forces. Unbelief was the antecedent, not the consequent, of their criticism.

The Crucial Point

According to the faith of the universal Church, the Pentateuch is one consistent, coherent, authentic, and genuine composition, inspired by God, written by Moses some fourteen centuries before Christ. It is, moreover, a portion of the Bible that is of paramount importance, for it is the basic substratum of the whole revelation of God and the introductory section of the Word of God, bearing His authority and given by inspiration through His servant Moses. That is the faith of the Church.

The Critics' Theory

According to the higher critics the Pentateuch consists of four completely diverse documents. They are (1) the Jehovist, (2) the Elohist, (3) the Deuteronomist, and (4) the Priestly Code documents, generally designated as J, E, D, P. These different works were composed at various periods of time from the ninth to the fifth centuries. These documents represent different traditions of the Hebrews, and are at variance in most important matters. They were surely not compiled and written by Moses. In the editorial process no limit apparently is assigned to the work of the redactors. Higher critics conclude that the documents contain three kinds of material: the probably true, the certainly doubtful, and the positively spurious.

A Discredited Old Testament

Not only is the Pentateuch discredited, but the rest of the Old Testament is dealt with in a similar manner. The Psalms are not from the time of David, but from the Maccabean age. Isaiah was written by a number of authors. Daniel was a purely pseudonymous work, written in the second century B.C. in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

A Discredited Bible

There can be no doubt that Christ and His apostles accepted the whole of the Old Testament as inspired in every part, from the first chapter of Genesis to the last chapter of Malachi. All was implicitly believed to be the very Word of God himself. And ever since their day the view of the universal Christian Church has been that the Bible is the Word of God. The Bible, according to the critics, can no longer be viewed in this light. It is not the Word in the old sense of that term. It simply *contains* the Word of God, and in many of its parts it is just as uncertain as any other human book. It is not even reliable history. Its records of ordinary history are full of falsifications and blunders.

A Revolutionary Theory

The higher criticism has been in the hands of men who disavow belief in God and Jesus Christ, therefore their theory is truly a revolutionary one. It is a theory of inspiration that completely

overthrows the accepted ideas of the Bible and its unquestioned standard of authority and truth. For whatever this so-called divine element is, it appears to be quite consistent with defective argument, incorrect interpretation, if not what the average man would call forgery or falsification. To accept it the Christian will have to readjust completely his ideas of honor and honesty, of falsehood and misrepresentation. Men used to think that forgery was a crime, and falsification a sin. Men used to think that inaccuracy would affect reliability and that proven inconsistencies would imperil credibility. Now it appears that all these may exist, and yet, marvelous to say, faith is not to be destroyed, but placed on a firmer foundation.

If Not Moses, Who?

If Moses did not write the books of Moses, who did? If there were three or four, or six, or nine authorized writers, why not fourteen, or sixteen, or nineteen? And what of the indeterminate number of redactors? Whence came their authority? Moses we know, and Samuel we know, and Daniel we know, but ye anonymous and pseudonymous, who are ye? The Pentateuch with Mosaic authorship, as Scriptural, divinely accredited, is upheld by tradition and scholarship, and appeals to reason. But a mutilated scrapbook of anonymous compilations, with its pre- and post-exilic redactors and redactions, is confusion worse confounded.

No Final Authority

Another serious result of the higher criticism is that it threatens the Christian system of doctrine and the whole fabric of systematic theology. Previously any text from any part of the Bible was accepted as a proof-text for the establishment of any truth of Christian teaching, and a statement from the Bible was considered an end of controversy. But now the higher critics think they have changed all that. They claim that the science of criticism has dispossessed the science of systematic theology.

Not Obscurantists

There are, however, two questions that must be faced by every student of the Bible. The first is this: Is not refusal of the higher critical system mere opposition to light and pro-

gress and the position of ignorant alarmists and obscurantists? The desire to receive all the light that the most fearless search for truth by the highest scholarship can yield, is the desire of every believer in the Bible. No really healthy Christian mind can advocate obscurantism. But it is the duty of every Christian to test all things, and to hold fast that which is good. The most ordinary Bible reader is learned enough to know that the investigation of the Book, that claims to be supernatural, by those who are the avowed enemies of all that is supernatural, and the study of subjects that can be understood only by men of humble and contrite heart, by men who are admittedly irreverent in spirit, must certainly be received with caution.

The Scholarship Argument

The second question is also serious: Are we not bound to receive these views when they are advanced, not by rationalists, but by Christians, and not by ordinary Christians, but by men of superior and unchallengeable scholarship? There is a widespread idea especially among younger men that the critics must be followed, because their scholarship settles the questions. This is a great mistake. No expert scholarship can settle questions that require a humble heart, a believing mind, and a reverent spirit, as well as a knowledge of Hebrew and philology; and no scholarship can be relied upon as expert which is manifestly characterized by a biased judgment, a curious lack of knowledge of human nature, and a still more curious deference to the views of men with a prejudice against the supernatural.

There is also a widespread idea among younger men that because scholars are experts in Hebrew that, therefore, their deductions as experts in language must be received. This, too, is a mistake. No scholar in the world ever has or ever will be able to tell the dates of each and every book in the Bible by the style of the Hebrew. And all the scholarship is not on one side. It is not true that the only people who oppose the higher critical views are the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the illiterate. Has rationalism its scholars? So has the orthodox position. And they are not one whit behind those who espouse the modern viewpoint. Shall we stand with the enemies of Scripture truth or with Christ in his view of the Old Testament?

We desire to stand with Christ and his Church. If we have any prejudice, we would rather be prejudiced against rationalism. If we have any bias, it must be against a teaching which unsteadies heart and unsettles faith. Even at the expense of being thought behind the times, we prefer to stand with our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ in receiving the Scriptures as the Word of God, without objection and without a doubt. A little learning, and a little listening to rationalistic theorizers and sympathizers may incline us to uncertainty; but deeper study and deeper research will incline us, as it inclined other scholars, to the profoundest conviction of the authority and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, and to cry, "Thy word is pure; therefore thy servant loveth it."

2

The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch

By Professor George F. Wright, D.D., LL.D.

Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio

and

Three Peculiarities of the Pentateuch Incompatible with the Graf-Wellhausen Theories of Its Composition

By Andrew C. Robinson, M.A.

Ballineen, County Cork, Ireland

Revised by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

For about a century an influential school of critics has deluged the world with articles and volumes, attempting to prove that the Pentateuch did not originate during the time of Moses, and that most of the laws attributed to him did not come into existence until several centuries after his death, and many of them not till the time of Ezekiel. By these critics the patriarchs are relegated to the realm of myth or dim legend, and the history of the Pentateuch generally is discredited.

Max
Dimant

I. THE BURDEN OF PROOF

In approaching the subject it is in place to consider the burden of proof. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has until very recent times been accepted without question by both Jews and Christians. Such acceptance, coming to us in unbroken line from the earliest times of which we have any information, gives it the support of what is called general consent, which, while perhaps not absolutely conclusive, compels those who would discredit it, to produce incontrovertible opposing evidence. But the evidence which the critics produce in this case is wholly circumstantial, consisting of inferences from a literary analysis of the documents, and from the application of a discredited evolutionary theory concerning the development of human institutions.

II. FAILURE OF THE ARGUMENT FROM LITERARY ANALYSIS

(a) *Evidence of Textual Criticism*

It is an instructive commentary on the scholarly pretensions of this whole school of critics that, without adequate examination of the facts, they have based their analysis of the Pentateuch upon the text which is found in our ordinary Hebrew Bibles. While students of the New Testament have expended an immense amount of effort in the comparison of manuscripts, and versions, and quotations to determine the original text, these Old Testament critics have done little in that direction. This is certainly a most unscholarly proceeding, yet it is admitted to be the fact by higher critics of note. Now the fact is that while the current Hebrew text, known as the Masoretic, was not established until about the seventh century A.D., we have abundant material with which to compare it, and to carry us back to that current a thousand years nearer the time of the original composition of the books. There are the Greek translation of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch, other Greek versions, Syriac renderings, and the Latin Vulgate of Jerome. All this material furnishes ample ground for correcting in minor particulars the current Hebrew text; and this can be done on well established scientific principles which largely eliminate conjectural emendations.

On bringing the light of this evidence to bear upon the subject some remarkable results are brought out, the most important of which relate to the very foundation on which the theories concerning the fragmentary character of the Pentateuch are based. The most prominent clue to the documentary division is derived from the supposed use by different writers of the two names, Jehovah and Elohim, to designate the deity. Now the original critical division into documents was made on the supposition that several hundred years after Moses there arose two schools of writers, one of which in Judah used the name Jehovah when speaking of God, and the other in the northern kingdom, Elohim. So the critics came to designate one set of passages as belonging to the J document and the other to the E document. These, they supposed, had been cut up and pieced together by a later editor, so as to make the existing continuous narrative. But when, as frequently occurred,

one of these words is found in passages where it is thought the other name should have been used, it is supposed, wholly on theoretical grounds, that a mistake had been made by the editor or redactor, and so with no further ceremony the objection is arbitrarily removed without consulting the direct textual evidence.

These facts, which are now amply verified, utterly destroy the value of the clue which the higher critics have all along ostentatiously put forward to justify their division of the Pentateuch into conflicting E and J documents, and this the critics themselves are now compelled to admit. The answer they give is that the analysis is correct, even if the clue which led to it be false. On further examination in the light of present knowledge, legitimate criticism removes a large number of the alleged difficulties which are put forward by higher critics, and renders of no value many of the supposed clues to the various documents.

(b) *Delusions of Literary Analysis*

But even on the assumption of the practical inerrancy of the Masoretic text the arguments against Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch drawn from the literary analysis, are seen to be the result of misdirected scholarship, and to be utterly fallacious. The long lists of words adduced as characteristic of the writers to whom the various parts of the Pentateuch are assigned, are readily seen to be occasioned by the different objects aimed at in the portions from which the lists are made. The absurdity of the claims of the higher critics to having established the existence of different documents in the Pentateuch by a literary analysis has been shown by a variety of examples. Professor C. M. Mead, the most influential of the American revisers of the translation of the Old Testament, in order to show the fallacy of their procedure, took the Epistle to the Romans, and arbitrarily divided it into three parts, according as the words "Christ Jesus," "Jesus," or "God" were used; and then by analysis showed that the lists of peculiar words characteristic of these three passages were even more remarkable than those drawn up by the destructive critics of the Pentateuch from the leading fragments into which they had divided it. The argument from literary analysis after the methods of these critics would prove the composite

character of the Epistle to the Romans, as fully as that of the critics would prove the composite character of the Pentateuch.

III. MISUNDERSTANDING LEGAL FORMS AND THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM

Another source of fallacious reasoning into which the critics have fallen arises from a misunderstanding of the sacrificial system of the Mosaic law. The critics assert that there was no central sanctuary in Palestine until several centuries after its occupation under Joshua, and that at a later period all sacrifices by the people were forbidden except at the central place when offered by the priests, unless it was where there had been a special theophany. But these statements show an entire misunderstanding of the facts. In interpreting Joshua 18:1, Judges 18:31, and I Samuel 2:24, the critics make a most humiliating mistake in repeatedly substituting "sanctuaries" for "altars," assuming that, since there was a plurality of altars in the time of the judges, there was by so much a plurality of sanctuaries. They have completely misunderstood the permission given in Exodus 20:24. The whole place referred to (so ASV) is Palestine, the Holy Land. Sacrifices such as the patriarchs had offered were always permitted to laymen, provided they used only an altar of earth or unhewn stones free from adornments characteristic of heathen altars. But altars of earth, having no connection with a temple of any sort, are not houses of God, and will not become such on being called sanctuaries by critics several thousand years after they have fallen out of use.

But besides the lay sacrifices which were continued from patriarchal times and guarded against perversion, there were other classes of offerings (Num. 28) established by statute. A failure to distinguish clearly between classes of sacrifices has led the critic into endless confusion, and error has arisen from their inability to understand legal terms and principles. The Pentateuch is not mere literature, but it contains a legal code. It is a product of statesmanship consisting of three distinct elements which have always been recognized by lawgivers; namely, the civil, the moral, and the ceremonial. All these strata of the law were naturally and necessarily in existence at the same time.

In putting them as successive strata, with the ceremonial law last, the critics have made an egregious and misleading blunder.

IV. THE POSITIVE EVIDENCE

The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is supported, among other facts, by the following weighty considerations. (1) The Mosaic era was a literary epoch in the world's history when such writings were common. In view of the codes of laws that antedated Moses' day, it would have been strange if such a leader had not produced a code of laws. (2) The Pentateuch so correctly reflects the conditions in Egypt at the period assigned to it, that it is difficult to believe that it was a literary product of a later age. (3) Its representation of life in the wilderness is so accurate, and so many of its laws are adapted only to that life, that it is incredible that literary men a thousand years later should have imagined it. (4) The laws themselves bear unmistakable marks of adaptation to the stage of national development to which they are ascribed. (5) The little use that is made of the sanctions of a future life is evidence of an early date, and of a peculiar divine effort to guard the Israelites against the contamination of Egyptian ideas on the subject. (6) The subordination of the miraculous elements in the Pentateuch to the critical junctures in the nation's development is such as could be obtained only in genuine history. (7) The whole representation conforms to the true law of historical development. Nations do not rise by virtue of inherent resident forces, but through the struggles of great leaders enlightened directly from on high or by contact with others who have already been enlightened.

The defender of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has no occasion to quail in the presence of the critics who deny that authorship and discredit its history. He may boldly challenge their scholarship, deny their conclusions, resent their arrogance, and hold on to his confidence in the well authenticated historical evidence which sufficed for those who first accepted it.

Finally, there are three, among other, very remarkable peculiarities in the Pentateuch which are incompatible with modern theories of its composition. The first is the absence of the name Jerusalem from the Pentateuch. On the traditional view the

Good!
 absence presents no difficulty; the fact that Bethel, Hebron, and other shrines are named, while Jerusalem is not, would merely mean that at these other shrines the patriarchs had built their altars, while at Jerusalem they had not. But from the modern view, which holds that the Pentateuch was in great part composed to glorify the priesthood in Jerusalem, and that the Book of Deuteronomy in particular was produced to establish Jerusalem as the central and only acceptable shrine for the worship of Israel, the omission seems very strange indeed. The conclusion is inescapable: at the time the Pentateuch was written, Jerusalem with all her sacred glories had not yet entered into the life of Israel.

The second remarkable peculiarity is the absence of any mention of sacred song from the Pentateuch. A strange omission this would be, if the Priestly Code, which defines the duties of the Levites, had been composed in post-exilic times, when Levite singers and songs of praise formed leading features in the ritual.

The third remarkable peculiarity is the absence of the divine title "Lord of Hosts" from the Pentateuch. Before the time of Samuel the title is never used; after his time it is used some 281 times. Why is it missing from the Pentateuch? It is an unmistakable mark that the Pentateuch could not have been composed in the way asserted by criticism. It would have been a literary impossibility for such a number of writers, extending over hundreds of years, to have one and all, never by accident, slipped into the use of this divine title for Jehovah, "Lord of Hosts," so much in vogue during those centuries. The reason is obvious: the Pentateuch was written before any of these features came into use.

3

The Bible and Modern Criticism

By David Heagle, D.D.

Emeritus, Stuttgart, Germany

Translated from the Original German

by F. Bettex, D.D.,

Abridged and emended by James H. Christian, Th.D.

Proof of the Bible's Inspiration

How does the Bible prove itself to be a divinely inspired, heaven-given book, a communication from a Father to His children, and thus a revelation?

First, by the fact that, as does no other sacred book in the world, it condemns man and all his works. It does not praise either his wisdom, his reason, his art, or any progress that he has made; but it represents him as being in the sight of God, a miserable sinner, incapable of doing anything good, and deserving only death and endless perdition. Truly, a book which is able thus to speak, and in consequence causes millions of men, troubled in conscience, to prostrate themselves in the dust, crying, "God be merciful to me a sinner," must contain more than mere ordinary truth.

Secondly, the Bible exalts itself far above all merely human books by its announcement of the great incomprehensible mystery that, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). Where is there a god among all the heathen nations, be he Osiris, Brahma, Baal, Jupiter or Odin, that would have promised those people that, by taking upon himself the sin of the world and suffering its punishment, he would thus become a savior and redeemer to them?

Thirdly, the Bible sets the seal of its divine origin upon itself by means of the prophecies. Very appropriately does God inquire,

through the prophet Isaiah, "Who, as I, shall call, and shall declare it, and set it in order for Me since I established the ancient people? and the things that are coming and shall come to pass, let them declare" (Ch. 44:7). Or says again, "I am God, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times, things not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure; calling a ravenous bird from the east, and the man of My counsel from a far country. Yea, I have spoken, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed, I will also do it" (Ch. 46:10, 11). Or, addressing Pharaoh, "Where are thy wise men, and let them tell thee, and let them know what the Lord of Hosts hath purposed upon Egypt" (Ch. 19:12). Again we say, where is there a god, or gods, a founder of religion, such as Confucius, Buddha, or Mohammed, who could, with such certainty, have predicted the future of even his own people? Or where is there a statesman who in these times can foretell what will be the condition of things in Europe one hundred or even ten years from now? Nevertheless the prophecies of Moses and his threatened judgments upon the Israelites have been literally fulfilled. Literally also have been fulfilled (although who at the time would have believed it?) the prophecies respecting the destruction of those great ancient cities, Babylon, Nineveh, and Memphis. Moreover, in a literal way has been fulfilled what the prophets David and Isaiah foresaw concerning the last sufferings of Christ—His death on the cross, His drinking of vinegar, and the casting of lots for His garments. There are also other prophecies which will still be most literally fulfilled, such as the promises made to Israel, the final judgment, and the end of the world. "For," as Habakkuk says, "the vision is yet for an appointed time, and will not lie. Though it tarry, wait for it; it will surely come" (Ch. 2:3).

Fourthly, the Bible has demonstrated its peculiar power by its influence with the martyrs. Think of the hundreds of thousands who, at different times and among different peoples, have sacrificed their all, their wives, their children, all their possessions, and finally life itself, on account of this book. Think of how they have, on the rack and at the stake, confessed the truth of the Bible, and borne testimony to its power.

Lastly, the Bible shows itself every day to be a divinely given book by its beneficent influence among all kinds of people. It converts to a better life the ignorant and the learned, the beggar on the street and the king upon his throne, yonder poor woman dwelling in an attic, the greatest poet and the profoundest thinker, civilized persons and uncultured savages. Despite all the scoffing and derision of its enemies, it has been translated into hundreds of languages, and has been preached by thousands of missionaries to millions of people. It makes the proud humble and the dissolute virtuous; it consoles the unfortunate, and teaches man how to live patiently and die triumphantly. No other book or collection of books accomplishes for man the exceeding great benefits accomplished by this book of truth.

Wonderful!

Modern Criticism and Its Rationalistic Method

In these times there has appeared a criticism which, constantly growing bolder in its attacks upon this sacred book, now decrees, with all self-assurance and confidence, that it is simply a human production. Besides other faults found with it, it is declared to be full of errors, many of its books to be spurious, written by unknown men at later dates than those assigned, etc., etc. The fundamental principle upon which this verdict is based is, as Renan expressed it, reason is capable of judging all things, but is itself judged by nothing. However, a purely rational revelation would certainly be a contradiction of terms; besides, it would be wholly superfluous. But when reason undertakes to speak of things entirely supernatural, invisible and eternal, it talks as a blind man does about colors, discoursing of things concerning which it neither knows nor can know anything; and thus it makes itself ridiculous. It has not ascended up to heaven, neither has it descended into the deep; and, therefore, a purely rational religion is no religion at all.

!!

Incompetency of Reason for Spiritual Truth

Reason alone has never inspired men with great sublime conceptions of spiritual truth, whether in the way of discovery or invention; but usually it has at first rejected and ridiculed such matters. Just so it is with these rationalistic critics, who have no appreciation or understanding of that high and sublime in God's

Word. They understand neither the majesty of Isaiah, the pathos of David's repentance, the audacity of Moses' prayers, the philosophic depth of Ecclesiastes, nor the wisdom of Solomon which "uttereth her voice in the streets." Ambitious priests, according to them, at a later date than is commonly assigned, compiled all those books to which we have alluded; also they wrote the Sinaitic law, and invented the whole story of Moses' life.

No Agreement Among the Critics

Do these critics then, to ask the least of them, agree with one another? Far from it. To be sure, they unanimously deny the inspiration of the Bible, the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, the fall of man and the forgiveness of sins through Christ; also prophecy and miracles, the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment, heaven, and hell. But when it comes to their pretendedly sure results, not any two of them affirm the same things, and their numerous publications create a flood of disputable, self-contradictory and naturally destructive hypotheses.

What Are the Fruits of This Criticism?

In the classroom it ensnares, in lecture halls it makes great pretences, for mere popular lectures it is still serviceable; but when the thunders of God's power break in upon the soul, when despair at the loss of all one has loved takes possession of the mind, when remembrance of a miserable lost life or of past misdeeds is felt and realized, when one is on a sickbed and death approaches, and the soul, appreciating that it is now on the brink of eternity, calls for a Savior—just at this time when its help is most needed, this modern religion utterly fails.

But suppose all the teachings of this criticism were true, what would it avail us? It would put us in a sad condition indeed. For then, sitting beside ruined temples and broken-down altars, with no joy as respects the hereafter, no hope of everlasting life, no God to help us, no forgiveness of sins, feeling miserable, all desolate in our hearts and chaotic in our minds, we should be utterly unable either to know or believe anything more. Can such a view of Christianity be true? No! If this modern criticism were true, then away with all so-called Christianity, which only deceives us with idle tales! Away with a religion which has nothing to

offer us but the commonplace teachings of morality! Away with faith! Away with hope! Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die!

Conclusion

Let us then, by repudiating this modern criticism, show our condemnation of it. What does it offer us? Nothing. What does it take away? Everything. Do we have any use for it? No! It neither helps us in life nor comforts us in death; it will not judge us in the world to come. For our Biblical faith we do not need either the encomiums of men, nor the approbation of a few poor sinners. We will not attempt to improve the Scriptures and adapt them to our liking, but we will believe them. We will not criticize them, but we will ourselves be directed by them. We will not exercise authority over them, but we will obey them. We will trust him who is the way, the truth, and the life. His Word shall make us free.

“Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God” (John 6:68, 69). “And he answered, Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast; that no man take thy crown” (Rev. 3:11).

4

Holy Scripture and Modern Negations

By Professor James Orr, D.D.

United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland

Abridged and emended by James H. Christian, Th.D.

Is there today in the midst of criticism and unsettlement a tenable doctrine of Holy Scripture for the Christian Church and for the world; and if there is, what is that doctrine? That is unquestionably a very pressing question at the present time. "Is there a book which we can regard as the repository of a true revelation of God and an infallible guide in the way of life, and as to our duties to God and man?" is a question of immense importance to us all. One hundred years ago, the question hardly needed to be asked among Christian people. It was universally conceded, taken for granted, that there is such a book, the book which we call the Bible. Here, it was believed, is a volume which is an inspired record of the whole will of God for man's salvation; accept as true and inspired the teaching of that book, follow its guidance, and you cannot stumble, you cannot err in attaining the supreme end of existence, in finding salvation, in grasping the prize of a glorious immortality.

Now a change has come. There is no disguising the fact that we live in an age when, even within the Church, there is much uneasy and distrustful feeling about the Holy Scriptures — a hesitancy to lean upon them as an authority and to use them as the weapons of precision they once were; with a corresponding anxiety to find some surer basis in external church authority, or with others, in Christ himself, or again in a Christian consciousness, as it is named — a surer basis for Christian belief and life. Sometimes the idea is taken up that the thought of an authority external to ourselves must be wholly given up; that only that can be accepted which carries its authority within itself by the appeal it makes

to reason or to our spiritual being, and therein lies the judge for us of what is true and what is false.

The idea of the authority of Scripture is a conception which lies in the Scriptures themselves. This belief in the Holy Scripture was accepted and acted upon by the Church of Christ from the first. The Bible itself claims to be an authoritative Book, and an infallible guide to the true knowledge of God and of the way of salvation. This view is implied in every reference made to it, so far as it then existed, by Christ and his Apostles. That the New Testament, the work of the Apostles and of apostolic men, does not stand on a lower level of inspiration and authority than the Old Testament, is, I think, hardly worth arguing. In that sense, as a body of writings of divine authority, the books of the Old and New Testament were accepted by the Apostles and by the Church of the post-apostolic age.

Take the writings of any of the early Church fathers, and you will find their words saturated with references to Scripture. You will find the Scriptures treated in precisely the same way as they are used in the biblical literature of today; namely, as the ultimate authority on the matters of which they speak.

By all means, let criticism have its rights. Let purely literary questions about the Bible receive full and fair discussion. Let the structure of books be impartially examined. If a reverent science has light to throw on the composition or authority or age of these books, let its voice be heard. On the other hand, we are not bound to accept every wild critical theory that any critic may choose to put forward as the final word on this matter. We are compelled to look at the presuppositions on which each criticism proceeds, and to ask, How far is the criticism controlled by those presuppositions? We are bound to look at the evidence by which the theory is supported, and to ask, Is it really borne out by that evidence? When theories are put forward with every confidence as fixed results, and we find them, as we observe them, still in constant process of evolution and change, constantly becoming more complicated, more extreme, more fanciful, we are entitled to inquire, Is this the certainty that it was alleged to be? *Now that is my complaint against much of the current criticism of the Bible* — not that it is criticism, but that it starts from the wrong basis, that

it proceeds by arbitrary methods, and that it arrives at results which I think are demonstrably false results.

There is certainly an immense change of attitude on the part of many who still sincerely hold faith in the supernatural revelation of God. I find it difficult to describe this tendency, for I am desirous not to describe it in any way which would do injustice to any Christian thinker, and it is attended by so many signs of an ambiguous character. Jesus is recognized by the majority of those who represent it as "the Incarnate Son of God," though with shadings off into more or less indefinite assertions even on that fundamental article, which make it sometimes doubtful where the writers exactly stand. The process of thought in regard to Scripture is easily traced. First, there is an ostentatious throwing overboard, joined with some expression of contempt, of what is called the verbal inspiration of Scripture — a very much abused term. Jesus is still spoken of as the highest revealer, and it is allowed that his words, if only we could get at them — and on the whole it is thought we can — furnish the highest rule of guidance for time and for eternity. But even criticism, we are told, must have its rights. Even in the New Testament the Gospels go into the crucible, and in the name of synoptical criticism, historical criticism, they are subject to wonderful processes, in the course of which much of the history gets melted out or is peeled off as Christian characteristics. Jesus, we are reminded, was still a man of his generation, liable to error in his human knowledge, and allowance must be made for the limitations in his conceptions and judgments. Paul is alleged to be still largely dominated by his inheritance of Rabbinical and Pharisaic ideas. He had been brought up a Pharisee, brought up with the rabbis, and when he became a Christian, he carried a great deal of that into his Christian thought, and we have to strip off that thought when we come to the study of his Epistles. He is therefore a teacher not to be followed further than our own judgment of Christian truth leads us. That gets rid of a great deal that is inconvenient about Paul's teaching.

The Old Testament and the Critics

If these things are done in the "green tree" of the New Testament, it is easy to see what will be done in the "dry tree" of the

Old. The conclusions of the more advanced school of critics are here generally accepted as once for all settled, with the result—in my judgment, at any rate—that the Old Testament is immeasurably lowered from the place it once held in our reverence. Its earlier history, down to about the age of the kings, is largely resolved into myths, legends, and fictions. It is ruled out of the category of history proper. No doubt we are told the legends are just as good as the history, and that the ideas which they convey to us are just as good, coming in the form of legends, as if they came in the form of fact.

But behold, its laws, when we come to deal with them in this manner, lack divine authority. They are the products of human minds at various ages. Its prophecies are the utterances of men who possessed indeed the Spirit of God, which is only in fuller degree what other good men, religious teachers in all countries, have possessed—not a spirit qualifying, for example, to give real predictions, or to bear authoritative messages of the truth to men. Consequently, in this whirl and confusion of theories which you will find in our magazines, encyclopedias, reviews, and books which have appeared to annihilate conservative believers, is it any wonder that many should be disquieted and unsettled, and feel as if the ground on which they have been wont to rest was giving way beneath their feet? So the question comes back with fresh urgency, “What is to be said of the place and value of Holy Scripture?”

Is There a Tenable Doctrine for the Christian Church of Today?

Let me try to indicate the lines along which I would answer the question, “Have we, or can we have, a tenable doctrine of Holy Scripture?” For a doctrine of Scripture which satisfies the needs of the Christian Church and measures up to the Bible’s claims for itself it seems to me that three things are indispensably necessary. These are: first, a more positive view of the structure of the Bible than at present obtains in many circles; second, the acknowledgement of a true supernatural revelation of God in the history and religion of the Bible; third, the recognition of a true supernatural inspiration in the record of that revelation. Can we affirm these three things? Will they bear the test? I think they will.

The Structure of the Bible

First as to the structure of the Bible, there is needed a more positive idea of that structure than is at present prevalent. You take much of the criticism and you find the Bible being disintegrated in many ways, and everything like structure falling away from it. You are told, for example, that the Books of Moses are made up of many documents, which are very late in origin and cannot claim historical value. You are told that the laws they contain are also, for the most part, of tolerably late origin, and the Levitical laws especially are of post-exilian construction; they were not given by Moses; they were unknown when the Children of Israel were carried into captivity. Their temple usage perhaps is embodied in the Levitical law, but most of the contents of that Levitical law were wholly unknown. They were the invention of priests and scribes in the post-exilian period. They were put into shape, brought before the Jewish community returned from Babylon, and accepted by it as the law of life. Thus, you have the history of the Bible turned pretty much upside down, and things take on a new aspect altogether.

Must I then, in deference to criticism, accept these theories, and give up the structure which the Bible presents? Taking the Bible as it stands, I find—and without any particular critical learning you will find it—what seems to be evidence of a very definite internal structure, part fitting into part and leading on to part, making up a unity of the whole in that Bible. The Bible has undeniably a structure as it stands. It is distinguished from Koran, Buddhist, Indian scriptures, and every other kind of religious books. It is distinguished just by this fact, that it is the embodiment of a great plan or scheme or purpose of divine grace extending from the beginning of time through successive ages and dispensations down to its culmination in Jesus Christ and the Pentecostal outpourings of the Spirit. The history of the Bible is the history of that development of God's redemptive purpose. The promises of the Bible mark the stages of its progress and its hope. The covenants of the Bible stand before us in the order of its unfolding. You begin with Genesis, which lays the foundation and leads up to the Book of Exodus; and the Book of Exodus in turn, with its introduction to the law-giving, leads up to what follows.

Deuteronomy looks back upon the history of the rebellions and the laws given to the people, and leads up to the conquest. I need not follow the later developments, coming away down through the monarchy and the prophecy and the rest, but you find it all gathered up and fulfilled in the New Testament. The Bible, as we have it, closes in Gospel and Epistle and Apocalypse, fulfilling all the ideas of the Old Testament. There the circle completes itself with the new heaven and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Here is a structure, a connected story, a unity of purpose extending through this Book and binding all its parts together. Is that structure an illusion? Do we only, and many with us, dream that it is there? Do our eyes deceive us when we think we see it? Or has somebody of a later date invented it, and put it all, inwrought it all, in these earlier records, legends and stories, or whatever you like to call it—skillfully woven into the story until it presents there the appearance of naturalness and truth? I would like to find the mind capable of inventing it, and then the mind capable of working it into a history once they got the idea itself. But if not invented, it belongs to the reality and the substance of the history; it belongs to the facts; and therefore to the Book that records the facts. There are internal attestations in that structure of the Bible to the genuineness of its contents that protest against the efforts that are so often made to reduce it to fragments and shiver that unity and turn it upside down. "Walk about Zion . . . tell the towers thereof; mark ye well her bulwarks"; you will find there is something there which the art of man will not avail to overthrow.

"Now, that is all very well," I hear some one say, "but there are facts on the other side; there are those manifold proofs which our critical friends adduce that the Bible is really a collection of fragments and documents of much later date, and that the history is really quite a different thing from what the Bible represents it to be." However, when I turn to the evidence I do not find it to have that convincing power which our critical friends assign to them.

I am not rejecting this kind of critical theory because it goes against my prejudices or traditions; I reject it simply because it seems to me the evidence does not sustain it, and that the stronger evidence is against it. I cannot go into details; but take just the

one point I have mentioned—this post-exilian origin of the Levitical law. I have stated what is said about that matter—that those laws and institutions pertaining to priests, Levites, and sacrifices that you find in the middle of the Pentateuch had really no existence, no authoritative form, and to a large extent no existence of any kind until after the Jews returned from Babylon, and then they were given out as a code of laws which the Jews accepted. But let the reader put himself in the position of that returned community, and see what the thing means. These exiles had returned from Babylon. They had been organized into a new community. They had rebuilt their temple, and then long years after that, when things had got into confusion, those two great men, Ezra and Nehemiah, came among them, and by and by Ezra produced and publicly proclaimed what he called the law of Moses, the law of God by the hand of Moses which he had brought from Babylon. A full description of what happened is given in the eighth chapter of the Book of Nehemiah. Ezra reads that law from his pulpit of wood day after day to the people, and the interpreter gives the sense. Now, mind you, most of the things in this book that he is reading to the people, had never been heard of before—never had existed, in fact; priests and Levites such as are there described had never existed. The law itself was long, complicated, and burdensome, but the marvelous thing is that the people meekly accept it all as true—meekly accept it as law, at any rate—and submit to it, and take upon themselves its burdens without a murmur of dissent.

That is a very remarkable thing to start with. But remember, further, what that community was. It was not a community with oneness of mind, but it was a community keenly divided in itself. If you read the narrative you will find that there were strong opposing factions; there were parties strongly opposed to Ezra and Nehemiah and their reforms; there were many, as you see in the Book of Malachi, who were religiously faithless in that community. But marvelous to say, they all join in accepting this new, burdensome, and hitherto unheard of law as the law of Moses, the law coming down to them from hoary antiquity. There were priests and Levites in that community who knew something about their own origin; they had genealogies and knew something about their

own past. According to the new theory, these Levites were quite a new order; they had never existed at all before the time of the exile, and they had come into existence through the sentence of degradation that the prophet Ezekiel had passed upon them in the 44th chapter of his book. History is quite silent about this degradation. If anyone asks who carried out the degradation, or why was it carried out, or when was it done, and how came the priests to submit to the degradation, there is no answer to be given at all. But it came about somehow, so we are told.

So these priests and Levites are there, and they stand and listen without astonishment as they learn from Ezra how the Levites had been set apart long centuries before in the wilderness by the hand of God, and had an ample tithe provision made for their support, and cities, and what not, set apart for them to live in. People know a little about their past. These cities never had existed except on paper; but they took it all in. They are told about these cities, which they must have known had never existed as Levitical cities. They not only hear but they accept the heavy tithe burdens without a word of remonstrance, and they make a covenant with God pledging themselves to faithful obedience to all those commands. Those tithes laws, as we discover, had no actual relation to their situation at all. They were drawn up for a totally different case. They were drawn up for a state of things in which there were few priests and many Levites. The priests were only to get the tithe of a tenth, but in this restored community there were a great many priests and few Levites. The tithe laws did not apply at all, but they accepted these as laws of Moses.

And so I might go over the provisions of the Law one by one—tabernacle, priests, ritual, sacrifices, and Day of Atonement, but these things, in their post-exilian form, had never existed; they were spun out of the inventive brains of scribes; and yet the people accepted them all as the genuine handiwork of the ancient lawgiver. Was ever such a thing heard of before? Try it in any city. Try to get the people to take upon themselves a series of heavy burdens of taxation or tithes or whatever you like, on the ground that it had been handed down from the middle ages to the present time. Try to get them to believe it; try to get them to obey it, and you will find the difficulty. Is it credible to anyone

who leaves books and theories in the study and takes a broad view of human nature with open eyes? I aver that for me, at any rate, it is not; and it will be a marvel to me as long as I am spared to live, how such a theory has ever gained the acceptance it has done among unquestionably able and sound-minded men. I am convinced that the structure of the Bible vindicates itself, and that these counter theories break down.

A Supernatural Revelation

I think it is an essential element in a tenable doctrine of Scripture, in fact the core of the matter, that it contains a record of a true supernatural revelation; and that is what the Bible claims to be — not a development of man's thoughts about God, and not what this man and that one came to think about God, how they came to have the ideas of a Jehovah, who was originally the storm-god of Sinai, and how they manufactured out of this the great universal God of the prophets—but a supernatural revelation of what God revealed himself in word and deed to men in history. If that claim to a supernatural revelation from God falls, the Bible falls, because it is bound up with it from beginning to end. Now, it is a must here that a great deal of our modern thought parts company with the Bible. I am quite well aware that many of our friends who accept these newer critical theories, claim to be just as firm believers in divine revelation and in Jesus Christ and all that concerns him, as I am myself. I rejoice in the fact, and I believe that they are warranted in saying that there is that in the religion of Israel which you cannot expunge, or explain on any other hypothesis but divine revelation.

But what I maintain is that this theory of the religion of the Bible which has been evolved, which has peculiarly come to be known as the critical view, had a very different origin—in men who did not believe in the supernatural revelation of God in the Bible. This school as a whole, as a widespread school, holds the fundamental position—the position which its adherents call that of the modern mind—that miracles did not happen and cannot happen. It takes the ground that they are impossible; therefore its followers have to rule everything of that kind out of the Bible record.

I have never been able to see how that position is tenable to a believer in a living personal God who really loves his creatures

and has a sincere desire to bless them. Who dares to assert that the power and will of such a Being as we must believe God to be—the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—is exhausted in the natural creation? Who can believe that there are no higher things to be attained in God's providence than can be attained through the medium of natural law? Who ventures to declare that there is in such a Being no capability of revealing himself in words and deeds beyond nature? If there is a dogmatism in the world, it is that of the man who claims to limit the Author of the universe by this finite bound. We are told sometimes that it is a far higher thing to see God in the natural than to see him in something that transcends the natural; a far higher thing to see God in the orderly regular working of nature than to suppose that there has ever been anything transcending that ordinary natural working. But the question is, Has this natural working not its limits? Is there not something that nature and natural workings cannot reach, cannot do for men, that we need to have done for us? And are we so to bind God that he cannot enter into communion with man in a supernatural economy of grace, an economy of revelation, an economy of salvation? Are we to deny that he has done so? That is really the dividing line both in Old Testament and New between the different theories. *Revelation*, surely, all must admit if man is to attain the clear knowledge of God that is needed; and the question is one of fact, Has God so revealed himself? And I believe that it is an essential part of the answer, the true doctrine of Scripture, to say, "Yes, God has so revealed himself, and the Bible is the record of that revelation, and that revelation shines in its light from the beginning to the end of it." Unless there is a whole-hearted acceptance of the fact that God has entered, in word and deed, into human history for man's salvation, for man's renovation, for the deliverance of this world, a revelation culminating in the great Revealer himself—unless we accept that, we do not get the foundation for the true doctrine of Holy Scripture.

The Inspired Book

Now, just a word in closing, on Inspiration. I do not think that anyone will weigh the evidence of the Bible itself very carefully without saying that at least it claims to be in a peculiar and especial manner an *inspired* book. There is hardly anyone, I think,

who will doubt that Jesus Christ treats the Old Testament in that way. Christ recognizes that it was a true divine revelation, that he was the goal of it all; he came to fulfil the law and the prophets. The Scriptures are the last word with him—"Have ye not read?" "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures." It is just as certain that the Apostles treated the Old Testament in that way, and that they claimed that in them and in their word was laid "the foundation on which the Church was built," Jesus Christ himself, as the substance of their testimony, being the chief corner-stone; "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets" (Ephesians 2:20; see 3:5). *J.W.S. misuse this.*

The Bible's Own Test of Inspiration

What does the Bible itself give us as the test of its inspiration? What does the Bible itself name as the qualities that inspiration imparts to it? Paul speaks in Timothy of the Sacred Writings that were able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. He goes on to tell us that All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, in order that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. When you go back to the Old Testament and its praise of the Word of God you will find the qualities of inspiration are just the same. "The law of the Lord is perfect," etc. Those are the qualities which the inspired Book is alleged to sustain—qualities which only a true inspiration of God's Spirit could give; qualities beyond which we surely do not need anything more.

Does anyone doubt that the Bible possesses these qualities? Look at its structure; look at its completeness; look at it in the clearness and fullness and holiness of its teachings; look at it in its sufficiency to guide every soul that truly seeks light unto the saving knowledge of God. Take the Book as a whole, in its whole purpose, its whole spirit, its whole aim and tendency, and the whole setting of it, and ask, Is there not manifest the power which you can only trace back, as it traces back itself, to God's Holy Spirit really in the men who wrote it?

5

Old Testament Criticism and New Testament Christianity

By Professor W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.

Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada

Revised by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

For some time a large number of Christians have felt compelled to object to the attitude of many scholars to the Old Testament Scriptures. Critical scholars have taught the absolute denial or only partial acceptance of the historical character of the patriarchs; the alleged unhistorical character of the records relating to the time of Moses, the unreliability of the prophets in their predictions of the future; the error of the New Testament writers in assigning historical value to the Old Testament records; and the liability to error even on the part of our Lord himself, who throughout repeatedly assumed the divine authority of the Old Testament. We do not question for an instant the right of Biblical criticism considered in itself. It is a necessity for all who use the Bible to employ their judgment on what is before them. What is called "higher" criticism is not only a legitimate, but a necessary method for all Christians, for by its use we are able to discover the facts and form of the Old Testament Scriptures. Our hesitation and objection are not intended to apply to the method, but to what is believed to be an illegitimate, unscientific, and unhistorical use of it.

1. *Is the Testimony of Nineteen Centuries of Christian History and Experience of No Account in This Question?*

For nearly eighteen centuries these modern views of the Old Testament were not heard of. Yet this is not to be accounted for by the absence of intellectual power and scholarship in the Church. Men like Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Erasmus, Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, to say nothing of the English Puritans and other theologians of the seventeenth century, were not

intellectually weak or inert, nor were they wholly void of critical insight with reference to Holy Scripture. Yet they, and the whole Church with them, never hesitated to accept the view of the Old Testament which had come down to them, not only as a heritage from Judaism, but as endorsed by the apostles. Omitting all reference to our Lord, it is not open to question that the views of Paul, Peter and John about the Old Testament were the views of the whole Christian Church until the end of the eighteenth century. And, making every possible allowance for the lack of historical spirit and modern critical methods, are we to suppose that the whole Church for centuries never exercised its mind on such subjects as the contents, history, and authority of the Old Testament?

Furthermore, this is a matter which cannot be decided by intellectual criticism alone. Scripture appeals to conscience, heart, and will, as well as to mind; and the Christian consciousness, the accumulated spiritual experience of the Body of Christ, is not to be lightly regarded, much less set aside, unless it is proved to be unwarranted by fact. While we do not say that "what is new is not true," the lateness of these modern critical views should give us pause, before we virtually set aside the spiritual instinct of centuries of Christian experience.

2. *Does Criticism Readily Agree with the Historical Position of the Jewish Nation?*

The Jewish nation is a fact in history, and its record is given to us in the Old Testament. There is no contemporary literature to check the account there given, and archaeology affords us assistance on points of detail only, not for any long or continuous period. This record of Jewish history can be proved to have remained the same for many centuries. Yet much of modern criticism is compelled to reconstruct the history of the Jews on several important points. It involves, for instance, a very different idea of the character of the earliest form of Jewish religion from that seen in the Old Testament as it now stands; its views of the patriarchs are largely different from the conceptions found on the face of the Old Testament narrative; its views of Moses and David are essentially altered from what we have before us in the Old Testament.

Now, what is there in Jewish history to support all this reconstruction? Absolutely nothing. We see through the centuries the great outstanding objective fact of the Jewish nation, and the Old Testament is both the means and record of their national life. It rose with them, grew with them, and it is to the Jews alone we can look for the earliest testimony to the Old Testament canon.

In view of these facts, it must be concluded that the fundamental positions of modern Old Testament criticism are utterly incompatible with the historic growth and position of the Jewish people. Are we not right, therefore, to pause before we accept this subjective reconstruction of history? Let anyone read the writings of Wellhausen, and then ask himself whether he recognizes at all in them the story as given in the Old Testament.

3. Are the Results of the Modern View of the Old Testament Really Established?

It is sometimes said that modern criticism is no longer a matter of hypothesis; it has entered the domain of facts. Some of its more zealous adherents have claimed a complete victory for its postulates. But is this really so? It is interesting and disconcerting also to find these same claimants speaking of questions as still open which were supposed to be settled and closed decades ago. In the first place, is the excessive literary analysis of the Pentateuch at all probable or even possible on literary grounds? Let anyone work through a section of Genesis in a critical introduction to the Old Testament or in a critical commentary, and see whether such an involved combination of authors is at all likely, or whether, even if likely, the various authors can now be distinguished? Is not the whole method far too purely subjective to be probable and reliable?

Further, the critics are not agreed as to the number of documents, or as to the portions to be assigned to each author. Some years ago criticism was content to say that Isaiah 40-66, though not by Isaiah, was the work of one author, an unknown prophet of the exile. But later writers consider these chapters the work of two writers, and that the whole Book of Isaiah did not receive its present form until long after the return from the exile.

Then, these differences in literary analysis involve differences of interpretation and differences of date, character, and meaning of particular parts of the Old Testament. The opinion has been voiced that new work has been sufficient to upset the entire current reconstructions of Israel's religion, and the statement issues from a reliable critical source. As long as statements of fact in the Old Testament are assumed to be generally false, so long will permanent results be impossible.

*4. Is the Position of Modern Criticism Really Compatible
With a Belief in the Old Testament as a Divine Revelation?*

The problem before us is not merely literary, nor only historical; it is essentially religious, and the whole matter resolves itself into one question: Is the Old Testament the record of a divine revelation? This is the ultimate problem. It is admitted by both sides to be almost impossible to minimize the differences between the traditional and the modern views of the Old Testament. They relate to different conceptions of the relation of God to the world, of the course of Israel's history, the process of revelation, and the nature of inspiration of the Scriptures. Israel's religion before the period of the great prophets was supposed to be identical with other Semitic religions, which were polytheistic. Does not the Old Testament reveal, however, the uniqueness of God's dealings with Israel from the time of Abraham to the eighth century B.C.?

We may next take the character of the narratives of Genesis. The real question at issue is their historical character. Modern criticism regards the accounts in Genesis as largely mythical and legendary. Yet it is certain that the Jews of the later centuries accepted these patriarchs as veritable personages, and the incidents associated with them as genuine history. Paul and the other New Testament writers assuredly held the same view. If, then, they are not historical, surely the truths emphasized by prophets and apostles from the patriarchal stories are so far weakened in their supports.

Take, again, the legislation which in the Pentateuch is associated with Moses, and almost invariably introduced by the phrase, "The Lord spake unto Moses." Modern criticism regards this legis-

lation as unknown until a thousand years after the time of Moses. Can this be accepted as satisfactory? Are we to suppose that "The Lord spake to Moses" is only a well-known literary device intended to invest the utterance with greater importance and more solemn sanction? This position, together with the generally accepted view of modern criticism about the forgery of Deuteronomy in the days of Josiah, cannot be regarded as in accord with historical fact or ethical principle.

Yet some critics strongly assert that the new views are compatible with belief in the divine authority of the Old Testament. Upon what grounds does this compatibility rest? To deny historicity, to correct dates by hundreds of years, to reverse judgments on which a nation has rested for centuries, to traverse views which have been the spiritual sustenance of millions, and then to say that all this is consistent with the Old Testament as a revelation from God, is at least puzzling, and will not afford either mental or moral satisfaction to very many. It is no mere question of how we may use the Old Testament for preaching, or how much is left for use after the critical views are accepted. But even our preaching will lack a great deal of the note of certitude. If we are to regard certain biographies as unhistorical, it will not be easy to draw lessons for conduct, and if the history is largely legendary, our deductions about God's government and providence must be essentially weakened. But the one point to be faced is the historic credibility of those parts of the Old Testament questioned by modern criticism, and the historical and religious value of the documents of the Pentateuch. It remains to be proved that modern views are in harmony with acceptance of the Old Testament as the record of a divine revelation.

5. Is Modern Criticism Based on a Sound Philosophy Such as Christians Can Accept?

At the basis of much modern thought is the philosophy known as idealism, which, as often interpreted, involves a theory of the universe that finds no room for supernatural interpositions of any kind. The great law of the universe, including the physical, mental, and moral realms, is said to be evolution, and though this doubtless presupposes an original Creator, it does not, on

the theory now before us, permit of any subsequent direct intervention of God during the process of development. This general philosophical principle applied to history has assuredly influenced, if it has not almost moulded, a great deal of modern criticism of the Old Testament. It is not urged that all who accept even the position of a moderate criticism, go the full length of the extreme evolutionary theory; but there can be no reasonable doubt that most of the criticism of the Old Testament is materially affected by an evolutionary theory of all history which tends to minimize divine intervention in the affairs of the people of Israel. It is certainly correct to say that the presupposition of much present-day critical reasoning is a denial of the supernatural, and especially of the predictive element in prophecy.

As to the theory of evolution regarded as a process of uninterrupted differentiation of existences, under purely natural laws, and without any divine intervention, it will suffice to say that it is not proved in the sphere of natural science, while in the realms of history and literature it is palpably false. The records of history and of literature reveal from time to time the great fact and factor of personality, the reality of personal power, and this determinative element has a peculiar way of setting at naught all idealistic theories of a purely natural and uniform progress in history and letters. Quite apart from instances of forceful personality as have arisen from time to time through the centuries, there is one Personality who has not yet been accounted for by any theory of evolution—the Person of Jesus of Nazareth.

There are sufficient data in current Old Testament criticism to warrant the statement that it proceeds from presuppositions concerning the origins of history, religion, and the Bible, which in their essence are subversive of belief in divine revelation. And such being the case, we naturally look with grave suspicion on results derived from so unsound a philosophical basis.

6. *Can Purely Naturalistic Premises Be Accepted Without Coming to Purely Naturalistic Conclusions?*

Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen are admittedly accepted as masters by their followers, and the results of their literary analysis of the Pentateuch have been generally regarded as con-

clusive. On the basis of this literary dissection, certain conclusions have been formed as to the character and growth of Old Testament religion, and as a result the history of the Jews is reconstructed. Now it is known that the leading critics deny the supernatural element in the Old Testament. This is the presupposition of their entire position. Will it be claimed that it does not materially affect their conclusions? And is there any safe or logical place to stop for those who accept so many of their premises? The extreme subjectivity of modern criticism is part of the logical outcome of its general position. The tendency of their views is towards a minimizing of the supernatural in the Old Testament.

Take, as one instance, the Messianic element. In spite of the universal belief of Jews and Christians in a personal Messiah, a belief derived in the first place solely from the Old Testament, and supported for Christians by the New Testament, modern criticism will not allow much clear and undoubted prediction of him. Insight into existing conditions is readily granted to the prophets, but they are not allowed to have had much foresight into future conditions connected with the Messiah. Yet Isaiah's glowing words remain, and demand a fair, full exegesis such as they do not get from many modern scholars.

If it be pointed out that many British and American higher critics have been firm believers in the divine authority of the Old Testament, and of a divine revelation contained therein, then it can be said with truth that these men, grounded in the Christian faith in days gone by, maintain their old convictions, but at the same time admit principles and methods which are logically at variance with them. There is also the danger that others, following their premises, will carry their positions to their logical conclusions.

7. Can We Overlook the Evidence of Archaeology?

It is well known that during the last hundred years a vast number of archaeological discoveries have been made in Egypt, Palestine, Babylonia, and Assyria. Many of these have shed remarkable light on the historical features of the Old Testament. A number of persons and periods have been illuminated by these

discoveries, and are now seen with a clarity which was before impossible. It is a simple and yet striking fact that not one of these discoveries during the whole of this time has given any support to the distinctive features and principles of the higher critical position, while, on the other hand, many of them have afforded abundant confirmation of the traditional and conservative view of the Old Testament. It is necessary to mention but a few of these confirmations. Archaeology has confirmed the antiquity of writing, the historicity of the account of the campaign of the kings in Genesis 14, the puzzling story of Sarah and Hagar, the Egypt of Joseph and Moses, the historicity of Sargon and Belshazzar, and the nature of the Aramaic language of Daniel and Ezra. It has been interesting to note how a number of leading archaeologists have abandoned many of their former higher critical positions, and come out forcefully in favor of the historicity and value of the Old Testament.

8. *Are the Views of Modern Criticism Consistent with the Witness of Our Lord to the Old Testament?*

The Christian Church approaches the Old Testament mainly and predominantly from the standpoint of the resurrection of Christ. We naturally ask what our Master thought of the Old Testament, for if it comes to us with his authority and we can discover his view of it, we ought to be satisfied. In the days of our Lord's life on earth one pressing question was, "What think ye of the Christ?" Another was, "What is written in the law? How readest thou?" These questions are still being raised in one form or another, and today as of old, the great problems—two storm-centers, as they have well been called—are Christ and the Bible. The two problems really resolve themselves into one, for Christ and the Bible are inseparable. If we follow Christ, he will teach us the Bible; and if we study our Bible, it will point us to Christ. Each is called the Word of God.

He came, among other things, to bear witness to the truth (John 18:37), and it is a necessary outcome of this purpose that he should bear infallible witness. He came to reveal God and God's will, and this implies and requires special knowledge. It demands that every assertion of his be true. The divine knowledge did not,

because it could not, undergo any change by the incarnation. He continued to exist in the form of God, even while he existed in the form of man (Phil. 2:6). In view of this position, we believe that we have a right to appeal to the testimony of Christ to the Old Testament. The place it occupied in his life and ministry is sufficient warrant for referring to his use of it. It is well known that, as far as the Old Testament canon is concerned, our highest authority is that of our Lord himself; and what is true of the Old Testament as a whole, is surely true of these parts to which our Lord specifically referred.

Let us be clear, however, as to what we mean in making this appeal. We do not for a moment intend to close all possible criticism of the Old Testament. There are numbers of questions untouched by anything our Lord said, and there is consequently ample scope for sober, necessary, and valuable criticism. But what we do say is, that anything in the Old Testament stated by our Lord as a fact, or implied as a fact, is, or ought to be, thereby closed for those who hold Christ to be infallible. Criticism can do anything that is not incompatible with the statements of our Lord; but where Christ has spoken, surely the matter is closed.

What, then, is our Lord's general view of the Old Testament? There is no doubt that his Old Testament was practically, if not actually, the same as ours, and that he regarded it as of divine authority, as the final court of appeal for all questions connected with it. The way in which he quotes it shows this. To the Lord Jesus the Old Testament was authoritative and final, because divine.

No one can go through the Gospels without being impressed with the deep reverence of our Lord for the Old Testament, and with his constant use of it in all matters of religious thought and life. His question, "Have ye never read?", his assertion "It is written," his testimony, "Ye search the Scriptures" (ASV), are plainly indicative of his view of the divine authority of the Old Testament as we have it. He sets his seal to its historicity and its revelation of God. He supplements, but never supplants it. He amplifies and modifies, but never nullifies it. He fulfills, but never makes void.

This general view is confirmed by his detailed references to the Old Testament. Consider his testimony to the persons and to the facts of the old covenant. There is scarcely a historical book from Genesis to II Chronicles, to which our Lord does not refer; while it is perhaps significant that his testimony includes references to every book of the Pentateuch, to Isaiah, to Jonah, to Daniel, and to miracles, the very parts most called in question today. Above all, it is surely of the deepest moment that at his temptation he should use three times as the Word of God the book (Deuteronomy) about which there has, perhaps, been the most controversy of all. Again, therefore, we say that everything to which Christ can be said, on any honest interpretation, to have referred, or which he used as a fact, is thereby sanctioned and sealed by the authority of our infallible Lord.

Nor can this position be met by the statement that Christ simply adopted the beliefs of his day without necessarily sanctioning them as correct. Of this there is not the slightest proof, but very much to the contrary. On some of the most important subjects of his day he went directly against prevailing opinion. His teaching about God, righteousness, the Messiah, tradition, the Sabbath, the Samaritans, women, divorce, John's baptism, were diametrically opposed to that of the time. And this opposition was deliberately grounded on the Old Testament, which our Lord charged them with misinterpreting. The one and only question of difference between him and the Jews as to the Old Testament was that of interpretation. Not a vestige of proof can be adduced that he and they differed at all in their general view of its historical character or divine authority. If the current Jewish views were wrong, can we think our Lord would have been silent on a matter of such importance, about a book which he cites or alludes to over four hundred times, and which he made his constant topic in teaching concerning himself? If the Jews were wrong, Jesus either knew it, or he did not. If he knew it why did he not correct them as in so many other and detailed instances? Who will dare to consider the other alternative?

Nor can this witness to the Old Testament be met by asserting that the limitation of our Lord's earthly life kept him within current views of the Old Testament which need not have been

true views. This statement ignores the essential force of his personal claim to be "the Word." On more than one occasion our Lord claimed to speak from God, and that everything he said had the divine warrant. Let us notice carefully what this involves. It is sometimes said that our Lord's knowledge was limited, and that he lived here as man, not as God. Suppose this is granted for argument's sake. Very well; as man he lived in God and on God, and he claimed that everything he said and did was from God and through God. If, then, the limitations were from God, so *also were the utterances*; and, as God's warrant was claimed for every one of these, they are by so much divine and infallible (Jn. 5:19, 30; 7:13; 8:26; 12:49; 14:24; 17:8). Even though we grant to the full a theory that will compel us to accept a temporary disuse or non-use of the functions of deity in the person of our Lord, yet the words actually uttered as man are claimed to be from God, and therefore we hold them to be infallible. We rest, therefore, upon our Lord's personal claim to say all and do all by the Father, from the Father, for the Father.

There is, of course, no question of partial knowledge after the resurrection, when our Lord was manifestly free from all limitations of earthly conditions. Yet it was after his resurrection also that he set his seal to the Old Testament (Luke 24:44). We conclude that our Lord's positive statements on the subject of the Old Testament are not to be rejected without charging him with error. If on these points, on which we can test and verify him, we find that he is not reliable, what real comfort can we have in accepting his higher teaching, where verification is impossible? We believe we are on absolutely safe ground, when we say that what the Old Testament was to our Lord, it must be and shall be to us.

We may be certain that no criticism of the Old Testament will ever be accepted by the Christian Church as a whole, which does not fully and satisfactorily account for: (1) its supernatural element, (2) the enlightened spiritual experience of the saints of God in all ages, (3) the general tradition of Jewish history and the unique position of the Hebrew nation through the centuries, (4) the apostolic conception of the authority and inspiration of the Old Testament, and (5) the universal belief of the Christian Church in our Lord's infallibility as a Teacher of the truth.

6

The Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament

By William Caven, D.D., LL.D.

Late Principal of Knox College, Toronto, Canada

Revised by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

Both Jews and Christians receive the Old Testament as a revelation from God, while the latter regard it as standing in close and vital relationship to the New Testament. Everything connected with the Old Testament has in recent years been subjected to the closest scrutiny—the authorship of its several books, the time when they were written, their style, their historical value, their religious and ethical teachings. Apart from the veneration with which we regard the Old Testament writings on their own account, the intimate connection which they have with the New Testament necessarily gives us the deepest interest in the conclusions which may be reached by Old Testament criticism. For us the New Testament dispensation presupposes the Mosaic, and the books of the New Testament touch those of the Old at every point.

We propose to take a summary view of the testimony of our Lord to the Old Testament, as it is recorded by the evangelists. The New Testament writers themselves largely quote and refer to the Old Testament, and the views which they express regarding the old economy and its writings are in harmony with the statements of their Master; but we here confine ourselves to what is related to the Lord himself. Let us consider, first, what is contained or necessarily implied in the Lord's testimony to the Old Testament Scriptures, and secondly, to the critical value of his testimony.

I. THE LORD'S TESTIMONY TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

Our Lord's authority may be cited in favor of the Old Testament canon as accepted by the Jews in his day. He never charges them with adding to or taking from the Scriptures, or in any way

tampering with the text. Had they been guilty of so great a sin, it is hardly possible that among the charges brought against them, this matter should not even be alluded to. The Lord reproaches his countrymen with ignorance of the Scriptures, and with making the law void through their traditions, but he never hints that they have foisted any book into the canon, or rejected any which deserved a place in it.

Now, the Old Testament canon of the first century is the same as our own. The evidence for this is complete, and the fact is hardly questioned. The New Testament contains, indeed, no catalogue of the Old Testament books, but the testimony of Josephus, of Melito of Sardis, or Origen, of Jerome, of the Talmud, decisively shows that the Old Testament canon, once fixed, has remained unaltered. It is certain that the Septuagint agrees with the Hebrew as to the canon, thus showing that the subject was not in dispute two centuries before Christ. Nor is the testimony of the Septuagint weakened by the fact that the Old Testament Apocrypha are added to the canonical books. The Lord, it is observed, never quotes any of the apocryphal books, nor refers to them.

No Part Assailed

If our Lord does not name the writers of the books of the Old Testament in detail, it may at least be said that no word of his calls in question the genuineness of any book, and that he distinctly assigns several parts of Scripture to the writers whose names they bear. The Law is ascribed to Moses; David's name is connected with the Psalms; the prophecies of Isaiah are attributed to Isaiah; and the prophecies of Daniel to Daniel. The references to Moses as legislator and writer are clear and numerous (Cf. Matt. 8:4; 19:8; Lk. 16:31; Mk. 7:10; Lk. 24:27, 44; Jn. 5:45-47; 7:19, 22, 23). The Psalms are quoted by our Lord more than once, but only once is a writer named. The 110th Psalm is ascribed to David; and the validity of the Lord's argument depends on its being Davidic. The reference, therefore, so far as it goes, confirms the inscriptions of the Psalms in relation to authorship. Isaiah is quoted in a number of passages (Cf. Matt 13:14, 15; Mk. 7:6; and Lk. 4:17, 18). In his great prophecy of the downfall of the Jewish commonwealth, the Lord cites Daniel 9:27 and 12:11 in Matthew 24:15.

Narratives and Records Authentic

When Christ makes reference to Old Testament narratives and records, he accepts them as authentic, as historically true. He does not give or suggest in any case a mythical or allegorical interpretation. The accounts of the creation, of the flood, the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as many incidents and events of later occurrence, are taken as authentic. It may, of course, be alleged that the Lord's references to the creation of man and woman, the flood, the cities of the plain, and the rest, equally serve his purpose of illustration whether he regards them as historical or not. But on weighing his words it will be seen that they lose much of their force and appropriateness unless the events alluded to had a historical character (Cf. Matt. 19:4, 5; 24:37, 39; 11:23, 24). These utterances, everyone feels, lose their weight, if there was no flood such as is described in Genesis, and if the destruction of wicked Sodom may be only a myth. Illustrations and parallels may, for certain purposes, be adduced from fictitious literature, but when the Lord would awaken the conscience of men and alarm their fears by reference to the certainty of divine judgment, he will not confirm his teaching by instances of punishment which are only fabulous. His argument that the holy and just God will do as he has done, will make bare his arm as in the days of old, is robbed, in this case, of all validity.

A view frequently urged is that, as with other nations, so with the Jews, the mythical period precedes the historical, and thus the earlier narratives of the Old Testament must be taken according to their true character. In later periods of the Old Testament we have records which, on the whole, are historical; but in the very earliest times we must not look for authentic history at all. We merely remark that our Lord's brief references to early Old Testament narrative would not suggest the distinction so often made between earlier and later Old Testament records on the score of trustworthiness.

The Old Testament from God

We advance to say that Christ accepts the Old Dispensation and its Scriptures as in a special sense from God; as having special, divine authority. Many who recognize no peculiar sacredness or authority in the religion of the Jews above other reli-

gions of the world, would readily admit that it is from God. But their contention is that all religions have elements of truth in them, that they all furnish media through which devout souls have fellowship with the Power which rules the universe, but that none of them should exalt its pretensions above the others, far less claim exclusive divine sanction; all of them being the product of man's spiritual nature, as molded by his history and environment, in different nations and ages.

But the utterances of Jesus Christ on this question of the divine origin of the Old Testament religion are unmistakable; and not less clear and decided is his language respecting the writing in which this religion is delivered. God is the source, in the directest sense, of both the religion and the records of it. No man can claim Christ's authority for classing Judaism with Confucianism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Parseeism. It is abundantly evident that the Jewish faith is to our Lord the one true faith, and that the Jewish Scriptures have a place of their own, a place which cannot be shared with the sacred books of other peoples, "For salvation is of the Jews."

Almost any reference of our Lord to the Old Testament will support the statement that he regards these Scriptures as from God. He shows that Old Testament prophecy is fulfilled in himself, or he vindicates his teaching and his claims by Scripture, or he enjoins obedience to the law, or he asserts the inviolability of the law till its complete fulfilment, or he accuses a blinded and self-righteous generation of superseding and nullifying a law which they were bound to observe (cf. Matt. 5:18; 15:4; 21:13; 22:32; and Mk. 7:8). So many passages of the Old Testament are quoted or alluded to by the Lord as having received, or as awaiting fulfilment, that it is scarcely necessary to make citations of this class. These all most certainly imply the authority of Scripture; for no man, no creature, can tell what is hidden in the remote future.

We are not forgetting that the Lord fully recognizes the provisional character of the Mosaic law and of the Old Dispensation. Were the Old faultless, no place would have been found for the New. Had grace and truth come by Moses, the advent of Jesus Christ would have been unnecessary. But in all this there is nothing to modify the proposition which we are illustrating, that

is, that our Lord accepts the Old Testament as from God, as stamped with divine authority, and as truly making known the divine mind and will.

God Speaks

Our Lord surely attributes to the Old Testament a far higher character than many have supposed. God speaks in it throughout. and while he will more perfectly reveal himself in his Son, not anything contained in the older revelation shall fail of its end or be convicted of error. Christ does not use the term "inspiration" in speaking of the Old Testament, but when we have adduced his words regarding the origins and authority of these writings, it will be evident that to him they are God-given in every part. It will be seen that his testimony falls not behind that of Paul (II Tim. 3:16) and Peter (II Pet. 1:21).

Words and Commands of God

In speaking of Christ as teaching that the Old Testament is from God we have referred to passages in which he says that its words and commands are those of God (Cf. Matt. 15:4 and Mk. 7:8, 9). Passages like these do more than prove that the Old Testament expresses on the whole the mind of God, and, therefore, possesses very high authority. If it can certainly be said that God spoke certain words, or that certain words and commandments are of God, we have more than a general endorsement. It needs, of course, no proof that the words quoted in the New Testament as spoken by God are not the only parts of the Old Testament which have direct divine authority. The same might evidently be said of other parts of the book. The impression left on every unprejudiced mind is that such quotations as the Lord made, are only specimens of a book in which God speaks throughout. There is surely no encouragement to attempt any analysis of Scripture into its divine and its human parts, to apportion the authorship between God and the human penman, for, as we have seen, the same words are ascribed to God and to his servant Moses. The whole is spoken by God and by Moses also. All is divine and at the same time all is human. The divine and the human are so related that separation is impossible.

Absolute Infallibility of Scripture

Attention may be called specially to three passages in which the Lord refers to the origin and the absolute infallibility of Scripture. They are Matthew 22: 42-45, John 10:34-36, and Matthew 5:17, 18. In the first, the reference is to Psalm 110, and our Lord says David was completely under the Spirit's influence in the production of the Psalm, so that the word has absolute authority. Such is clearly the Lord's meaning, and the Pharisees have no reply to his argument. In the second passage Christ vindicates himself from the charge of blasphemy in claiming to be the Son of God, and that on the basis that the Old Testament Scripture could not be broken. The authority of Scripture thus extends to its individual terms (in this case, "gods"). If this is not verbal inspiration, it is difficult to see what is. In the last text the Lord in his Sermon on the Mount refers to his own relation to the Old Testament economy and its Scriptures. No stronger words could be employed to affirm the divine authority of every part of the Old Testament; for the law and the prophets mean the entire Old Testament. The question now remains, Can the words of Christ be taken at their full meaning, or must they be discounted for some reason or other? This question is of momentous import and will be considerably presently.

Fulfilment of Prophecy

The inspiration of the Old Testament is clearly implied in the many declarations of our Lord respecting the fulfillment of prophecies contained in them. It is God's prerogative to know, and to make known, the future. Human presage cannot go beyond what is foreshadowed in events which have transpired, or is wrapped up in causes which we plainly see in operation. If, therefore, the Old Testament reveals, hundreds of years in advance, what is coming to pass, omniscience must have directed the pen of the writer; these Scriptures must be inspired (Cf. Matt. 26:31; Jn. 5:46, 15:25; and Lk. 24:44-46 for such predictions). To teach that the Old Testament contains authentic predictions is, as we have said, to teach that it is inspired. The challenge of Isaiah is in point (Isa. 41:23).

We thus find that our Lord recognizes the same Old Testament canon we have, that so far as he makes reference to particular

books of the canon he ascribes them to the writers whose names they bear, that he regards the Jewish religion and its sacred books as in a special sense from God, that the writers of Scripture, in his view, spoke in the Spirit, that their words are so properly chosen that an argument may rest on the exactness of a term, that no part of Scripture shall fail of its end or be convicted of error, and that the predictions of Scripture are genuine predictions, which must all in their time receive fulfillment.

II. THE VALUE OF CHRIST'S TESTIMONY

It remains that we should briefly consider the value for the student of the Bible, of Christ's testimony to the Old Testament. Can we accept the utterances of Christ on these matters as having value, as of authority, in relation to biblical scholarship? Can we take them at their face value, or must they be discounted? There are two ways in which it is sought to invalidate Christ's testimony to the Old Testament.

1. *Ignorance of Jesus Alleged*

It is claimed that Jesus had no knowledge beyond that of his contemporaries as to the origin and literary characteristics of the Scriptures. The Jews believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, that the narratives of the Old Testament are all authentic history, and that the words of Scripture are all inspired. Christ shared the opinions of his countrymen on these topics, even when they were in error. To hold this view, it is maintained, does not detract from the Lord's qualifications for his proper work, which was religious and spiritual, not literary; for in relation to the religious value of the Old Testament and its spiritual uses and applications he may confidently be accepted as our guide. His knowledge was adequate to the delivery of doctrine, but did not necessarily extend to questions of scholarship and criticism. Of these he speaks as any other man; and to seek to arrest or direct criticism by appeal to his authority, is procedure which can only recoil on those who adopt it. This view is advanced, not only by critics who reject the deity of Christ, but by many who profess to believe that doctrine.

The doctrine of the *kenosis* is invoked to explain the imperfection of our Lord's knowledge on critical questions, as evi-

denced by the way in which he speaks of the Pentateuch and of various Old Testament problems. The subject of the limitation of Christ's knowledge during his earthly life is a difficult one, and its consideration is not in place here. But we may confidently affirm that the Lord's knowledge was entirely adequate to the perfect discharge of his prophetic office. To impute imperfection to him as the Teacher of the Church were indeed impious. Is it not quite clear that if the Lord's teaching be found in error, then his prophetic office is assailed? For the allegation is that, in holding fast to what he is freely allowed to have taught, we are imperiling the interests of faith. The critics whom we have in view must admit either that the points in question are of no importance, or that the Lord was imperfectly qualified for his prophetic work. Those who have reverence for the Bible will not admit either position.

2. *Theory of Accommodation*

The theory of accommodation is brought forward in explanation of those references of Christ to the Old Testament which endorse what are regarded as inaccuracies or popular errors. He spoke, it is said, regarding the Old Testament after the current opinion and belief. This belief was sometimes right and sometimes wrong; but where no interest of religion or morality was affected, where spiritual truth was not involved, he allowed himself, even where the common belief was erroneous, to speak in accord with it. The Lord is declared to have acted prudently, for no good end could have been served, it is asserted, by crossing the common opinion upon matters of little importance, and thus awakening or strengthening suspicion as to his teaching in general. As to the accommodation thus supposed to have been practiced by our Lord, we observe that if it implies, as the propriety of the term requires, a more accurate knowledge on his part than his language reveals, it becomes difficult in many instances to vindicate his perfect integrity.

Furthermore, we may say that if our Lord's statements about the authorship of parts of Scripture give a measure of countenance to opinions which are standing in the way of both genuine scholarship and of faith, it is hard to see how they can be regarded as instances of a justifiable accommodation. It seems to us that in

this case you cannot vindicate the Lord's absolute truthfulness except by imputing to him a degree of ignorance which would unfit him for his office as permanent Teacher of the Church.

Two Positions Clear

Two positions may be affirmed: (1) The legislation of the Pentateuch is actually ascribed to Moses by the Lord. If this legislation is in the main long subsequent to Moses, and a good deal of it later than the exile, the Lord's language is positively misleading, and endorses an error which vitiates the entire construction of Old Testament history and the development of religion in Israel. (2) Moses is the writer of the law and it may with propriety be spoken of as his writings. The words of Jesus evidence that he regarded Moses as the writer of the books which bear his name. Less than this robs several of our Lord's statements of their point and force.

If all Scripture bears testimony to Christ, we cannot refuse to hear him when he speaks of its characteristics. It is folly, it is unutterable impiety, to decide differently from the Lord any question regarding the Bible on which we have his verdict; nor does it improve the case to say that we shall listen to him, when he speaks of spiritual truth, but shall count ourselves free when the question is one of scholarship. Alas for our scholarship when it brings us into controversy with him who is the Prophet, as he is the Priest and King of God, and by whose Spirit both prophets and apostles spoke!

Our object has been to show that the Lord regards the entire book, or collection of books, of the Old Testament, as divine, authoritative, infallible. Our Lord's testimony to the character of the Old Testament must remain unimpaired.

7

The Internal Evidence of the Fourth Gospel

by Canon G. Osborne Troop, M. A.

Montreal, Canada

The whole Bible is stamped with the divine "Hall-Mark"; but the Gospel according to St. John is *primus inter pares*. Through it, as through a transparency, we gaze entranced into the very holy of holies, where shines in unearthly glory "the great vision of the face of Christ." Yet man's perversity has made it the "storm center" of New Testament criticism, doubtless for the very reason that it bears such unwavering testimony both to the deity of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and to his perfect humanity. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel is no unhistoric, idealized vision of the later, dreaming church, but is, as it practically claims to be, the picture drawn by "the disciple whom Jesus loved," an eye-witness of the blood and water that flowed from his pierced side. These may appear to be mere unsupported statements, and as such will at once be dismissed by a scientific reader. Nevertheless the appeal of this article is to the instinct of the "one flock" of the "one Shepherd." "They know his voice . . . a stranger will they not follow."

1. There is one passage in this Gospel that flashes like lightning—it dazzles our eyes by its very glory. To the broken-hearted Martha the Lord Jesus says with startling suddenness, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die."

what
a
claim!

It is humbly but confidently submitted that these words are utterly beyond the reach of human invention. It could never have entered the heart of man to say, "I am the resurrection and the life." "There is a resurrection and a life," would have been a great and notable saying, but this speaker identifies himself with

the resurrection and with life eternal. The words can only be born from above, and he who utters them is worthy of the utmost adoration of the surrendered soul.

In an earlier chapter John records a certain question addressed to and answered by our Lord in a manner which has no counterpart in the world's literature. "What shall we do," the eager people cry; "What shall we do that we might work the works of God?" "This is the work of God," our Lord replies, "that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John 6:28, 29). I venture to say that such an answer to such a question has no parallel. This is the work of God that ye accept me. I am the root of the tree which bears the only fruit pleasing to God. Our Lord states the converse of this in chapter 16, when he says that the Holy Spirit will "convict the world of sin . . . because they believe not on me." The root of all evil is unbelief in Christ. The condemning sin of the world lies in the rejection of the Redeemer. Here we have the root of righteousness and the root of sin in the acceptance or rejection of his wondrous personality. This is unique, and proclaims the Speaker to be "separate from sinners" though "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Truly,

*He is his own best evidence,
His witness is within.*

2. Pass on to the fourteenth chapter, so loved of all Christians. Listen to that voice, which is as the voice of many waters, as it sounds in the ears of the troubled disciples: "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe *also* in *me*. In my Father's house are many mansions: *if it were not so, I would have told you*. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

Who is he who dares to say: "Ye believe in *God*, believe *also* in *me*"? He ventures thus to speak because he is the Father's Son. Man's son is man: can God's Son be anything less than God? Elsewhere in this Gospel he says: "I and the Father are one." The fourteenth chapter reveals the Lord Jesus as completely at home in the heavenly company. He speaks of his Father and of the Holy Spirit as himself being one of the utterly holy family. He knows all about his Father's house with its many mansions. He

was familiar with it before the world was. Mark well, too, the exquisite touch of transparent truthfulness: "If it were not so, I would have told you." An ear-witness alone could have caught and preserved that touching parenthesis, and who more likely than the disciple whom Jesus loved?

As we leave this famous chapter let us not forget to note the wondrous words in verse 23: "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him."

This saying can only be characterized as blasphemous, if it be not the true utterance of one equal with God. On the other hand, does any reasonable man seriously think that such words originated in the mind of a forger? "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice," and surely that voice is here.

3. When we come to chapter 17 we pass indeed into the very inner chamber of the King of kings. It records the highpriestly prayer of our Lord, when he "lifted up his eyes to heaven and said, Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son that thy Son may also glorify thee." Let any man propose to himself the awful task of forging such a prayer, and putting it into the mouth of an imaginary Christ. The brain reels at the very thought of it. It is, however, perfectly natural that St. John should record it. It must have fallen upon the ears of himself and his fellow-disciples amidst an awe-stricken silence in which they could hear the very throbbing of their listening hearts. For their very hearts were listening through their ears as the Son poured out his soul unto the Father. It is a rare privilege, and one from which most men would sensitively shrink, to listen even to a fellow-man alone with God. Yet the Lord Jesus in the midst of his disciples laid bare his very soul before his Father, as really as if he had been alone with him. He prayed with the cross and its awful death full in view, but in the prayer there is no slightest hint of failure or regret, and there is no trace of confession of sin or need of forgiveness. These are all indelible marks of genuineness. It would have been impossible for a sinful man to conceive such a prayer. But all is consistent with the character of him who "spake as never man spake," and could challenge the world to convict him of sin.

With such thoughts in mind, let us now look more closely into the words of the prayer itself.

"Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and *Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*"

Here we have again the calm placing of himself on a level with the Father in connection with eternal life. And it is not out of place to recall the consistency of this utterance with that often-called "Johannine" saying recorded in St. Matthew and St. Luke: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him."

We read also in St. John 14:6: "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." And as we reverently proceed further in the prayer we find him saying: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

These words are natural to the Father's Son as we know and worship him, but they are beyond the reach of an uninspired man, and who can imagine a forger inspired of the Holy Ghost? Such words would, however, be graven upon the very heart of an ear-witness such as the disciple whom Jesus loved. *Yes!*

We have in this prayer also the fuller revelation of the "one flock" and "one Shepherd" pictured in chapter ten: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: That the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me."

In these holy words there breathes a cry for such a unity as never entered into the heart of mortal man to dream of. It is no

RV denies this!
Preexistence

cold and formal ecclesiastical unity, such as that suggested by the curious and unhappy mistranslation of "one fold" for "one flock" in St. John 10:16. It is the living unity of the living flock with the living Shepherd of the living God. It is actually the same as the unity subsisting between the Father and the Son. And according to St. Paul in Rom. 8:19, the creation is waiting for its revelation. The one Shepherd has from the beginning had his one flock in answer to his prayer, but the world has not yet seen it, and is therefore still unconvinced that our Jesus is indeed the Sent of God. The world has seen the Catholic Church and the Roman Catholic Church but the Holy Catholic Church no eye as yet has seen but God's. For the Holy Catholic Church and the Shepherd's one flock are one and the same, and the world will not see either "till he come." The *Holy Catholic Church* is an object of faith and not of sight, and so is the one flock. In spite of all attempts at elimination and organization wheat and tares together grow, and sheep and wolves-in-sheep's-clothing are found together in the earthly pasture grounds. But when the Good Shepherd returns he will bring his beautiful flock with him, and eventually the world will see and believe. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"

The mystery of this spiritual unity lies hidden in the high-priestly prayer, but we may feel sure that no forger could ever discover it, for many of those who profess and call themselves Christians are blind to it even yet.

4. The "Christ before Pilate" of St. John is also stamped with every mark of sincerity and truth. What mere human imagination could evolve the noble words: "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence . . . To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice"?

The whole wondrous story of the betrayal, the denial, the trial, the condemnation and crucifixion of the Lord Jesus, as given through St. John, breathes with the living sympathy of an eye-

witness. The account, moreover, is as wonderful in the delicacy of its reserve as in the simplicity of its recital. It is entirely free from sensationalism and every form of exaggeration. It is calm and judicial in the highest degree. If it is written by the inspired disciple whom Jesus loved, all is natural and easily "understood of the people"; while on any other supposition, it is fraught with difficulties that cannot be explained away. "I am not credulous enough to be an unbeliever," is a wise saying in this as in many similar connections.

5. The Gospel opens and closes with surpassing grandeur. With divine dignity it links itself with the opening words of Genesis: "*In the beginning* was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was *God* . . . And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." What a life-like contrast with this sublime description is found in the introduction of John the Baptist: "There came *a man* sent from God whose name was John." In the Incarnation Christ did not become *a man* but *man*. Moreover, in this St. Paul and St. John are in entire agreement.

"There is one God," says St. Paul to Timothy; "one Mediator also between God and man — *himself man* — Christ Jesus." The reality of the divine Redeemer's human nature is beautifully manifested in the touching interview between the weary Saviour and the guilty Samaritan woman at the well; as also in his perfect human friendship with Mary and Martha and their brother Lazarus, culminating in the priceless words, "Jesus wept."

And so by the bitter way of the Cross the grandeur of the Incarnation passes into the glory of the Resurrection. The last two chapters are alive with thrilling incident. If any one wishes to form a true conception of what those brief chapters contain, let him read "Jesus and the Resurrection," by the saintly Bishop of Durham (Dr. Handley Moule) and his cup of holy joy will fill to overflowing. At the empty tomb we breathe the air of the unseen kingdom, and presently we gaze enraptured on the face of the Crucified but risen and ever-living King. Mary Magdalene, standing in her broken-hearted despair, is all unconscious of the wondrous fact that holy angels are right in front of her and standing

behind her is her living Lord and Master. Slowly but surely the glad story spreads from lip to lip and heart to heart, until even the honest but stubborn Thomas is brought to his knees, crying in a burst of remorseful, adoring joy, "My Lord and my God!"

Then comes the lovely story of the fruitless all-night toil of the seven fishermen, the appearance at dawn of the Stranger on the beach, the miraculous draught of fishes, the glad cry of recognition, "It is the Lord!", the never-to-be-forgotten breakfast with the risen Saviour, and his searching interview with Peter, passing into the mystery of St. John's old age.

In all these swiftly-drawn outlines we feel ourselves instinctively in the presence of the truth. We are crowned with the Saviour's beautitude: "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed," and we are ready to yield a glad assent to the statement which closes chapter twenty: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life in his Name."

8

The Early Narratives of Genesis

By Professor James Orr, D.D.

United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland

Revised by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

By the early narratives of Genesis are to be understood the first eleven chapters of the book, those which precede the time of Abraham. These chapters present peculiarities of their own, although the critical treatment applied to them is not confined to these chapters, but extends throughout the whole Book of Genesis, the Book of Exodus, and the later history with much the same result in reducing them to legend.

We may begin by looking at the matter covered by these eleven chapters, to see what they contain. First, we have the sublime introduction to the Book of Genesis, and to the whole Bible, in the creation account in Genesis 1. This chapter manifestly stands in its fit place as the preface to all that follows. Where is there anything like it in all literature? There is nothing anywhere, in Babylonian legend or anywhere else. You may ask what interest religious faith has in the doctrine of creation, in any theory or speculation on how the world came to be. The answer is that it has the very deepest interest. The interest of religion in the doctrine of creation is that this doctrine is our guarantee for the dependence of all things on God, the ground of our assurance that everything in nature and providence is at his disposal. Suppose there was anything in the universe that was not created by God, that existed independently of him, how could we be sure that that element might not thwart, defeat, destroy the fulfilment of God's purpose? The Biblical doctrine of creation forever excludes that supposition.

Following on this primary account of creation is a second narrative in a different style, from chapter 2 to 4, but closely

connected with the first by the words, "In the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven." This is sometimes spoken of as a second narrative of creation, and is often said to contradict the first. But this is a mistake. As has been pointed out before, this second narrative is not a history of creation in the sense of the first at all. It has nothing to say of the creation of either heaven or earth, of the heavenly bodies, of the general world of vegetation. It deals simply with man and God's dealings with man when first created, and everything in the narrative is regarded and grouped from this point of view. The heart of the narrative is the story of the temptation and the fall of man. It is sometimes said that the fall is not alluded to in later Old Testament books, and therefore cannot be regarded as an essential part of revelation. It would be truer to say that the story of the fall, standing at the beginning of the Bible, furnishes the key to all that follows. What is the picture given in the whole Bible? Is it not that of a world turned aside from God, living in rebellion against him, disobedient to his calls, and resisting his grace? What is the explanation of this universal apostasy and transgression, if it is not that man has fallen from his first estate? For certainly this is not the state in which God made man, or wishes him to be. The truth is, if this story of the fall were not there at the beginning of the Bible, we would need to put it there for ourselves in order to explain the moral state of the world as the Bible pictures it to us, and as we know it to be. In chapter 4, as an appendix to these chapters, there follows the story of Cain and Abel, with brief mention of the commencement of civilization in Cain's line, and of the start of a godly line in Seth.

Returning to the style of Genesis 1, we have the genealogical line of Seth from Adam to Noah, in chapter 5. You are struck with the longevity of those patriarchal figures in the dawn of time, but not less with the constant sad refrain which ends each notice, Enoch's alone excepted, "and he died." This chapter connects directly with the creation account in Genesis 1, but presupposes equally the narrative of the fall in the intervening chapters. Critical works often assert the contrary, but some of the leading critics must admit that the story of the flood presupposes the fall narrative.

Then you come to the flood story in Genesis 6, in which two narratives are alleged to be blended. Yet criticism itself must admit that these two stories fit wonderfully into each other, and the one is incomplete without the other. If one, for instance, gives the command to Noah and his house to enter the ark, it is the other that narrates the building of the ark. What is still more striking, when you compare the Bible stories with the Babylonian account of the deluge, you find that it takes both of these so-called narratives in Genesis to make up the one complete story of the tablets. Following the flood and the covenant with Noah, the race of man spreads out again as shown in the table of nations in chapter 10. In 10:25 it is noted that in the days of Peleg the earth was divided; then in chapter 11 you have the story of the divine judgment at Babel confusing human speech, and this is followed by a new genealogy extending to Abraham.

Such is a brief survey of the material, and on the face of it, it must be admitted that this is a wonderfully well-knit piece of history of its own kind which we have before us, not in the least resembling the loose, incoherent, confused mythologies of other nations. There is nothing resembling it in any other history or religious book, and when we come to speak of the great ideas which pervade it, and give it its unity, our wonder is still increased. Critical scholars will acknowledge the great ideas, but they claim they were not there originally, but inserted later by the prophets to make the old legends religiously profitable. It is preferable by far to believe that the great ideas were there from the very first. *Where did Prophets get their ideas?*

The truth is, a great deal depends on the method of approach to these old narratives. There is a saying, "Everything can be laid hold of by two handles," and that is true of these ancient stories. Approach them in one way and they are a bundle of fables, legends, myths, without historical basis of any kind. Then these myths can be treated in such a way that Cain is composed originally out of three distinct figures, blended together, Noah out of another three, and so on. Approach these narratives in another way and they are the oldest and most precious traditions of our race; worthy in their intrinsic merit of standing where they do at the commencement of the Word of God, and capable

of maintaining their right to be there; not merely vehicles of great ideas, but presenting in their own ancient way the memory of great historic truths. The story of the fall, for example, is not a myth, but embodies the shuddering memory of an actual moral catastrophe in the beginning of our race, which brought woe and death into the world.

We come now to the question, Is there any external corroboration or confirmation of these early narratives in Genesis? The remarkable discoveries in Babylonia are well known, and throw extraordinary light on the high culture of early Babylonia. Here, long before Abraham, we find ourselves in the midst of cities, arts, books, libraries, and Abraham's own age was the flourishing period of this civilization. Instead of Israel's being a people just emerging from the dim dawn of barbarism, we find in the light of these discoveries that it was a people on whom had converged the riches of a civilization extending millenniums into the past. For us the chief interest of these discoveries is the help they give us in answering the question, How far do these narratives in Genesis embody for us the oldest traditions of our race? There are two reasons which lead us to look with some confidence to Babylonia for the answer to this question. For one thing, in early Babylonia we are already far back into the times to which many of these traditions relate; for another, the Bible itself points to Babylonia as the original area of those traditions. Eden was in the region of Babylonia, as shown by its rivers, the Euphrates and Tigris. It was in Babylonia the ark was built; and on a mountain in the vicinity of Babylonia the ark rested. It was from the plain of Shinar, in Babylonia, that the new dispersion of the race took place. To Babylonia, therefore, if anywhere, we are entitled to look for light on these ancient traditions, and we find it.

Take only one or two examples. The first is that old tenth chapter of Genesis, the table of nations. It has been acclaimed an ethnographical document of the first importance. Here we have (verses 8-10) certain statements about the origin of Babylonian civilization. We find (1) that Babylonia is one of the oldest of civilizations; (2) that the Assyrian civilization was derived from Babylonia; and (3) strangest of all, that the founders of the

Babylonian civilization were not Semites, but Hamites, descendants of Cush. Each of these statements was in contradiction to old views, and to what was currently believed about these ancient people until the discoveries taught otherwise. Yet it will not be disputed that exploration has justified the Bible on each of these points.

Glance now at the stories of creation, Paradise, and of the deluge. Some cuneiform accounts bear a remote resemblance to the story of Paradise and the fall. On the other hand, the libraries of Mesopotamia have furnished versions of the story of the deluge. The flood narrative, like the Babylonian creation story, is debased, polytheistic, and mythical with little analogy to the account in Genesis. Did the Israelites borrow their narrative from these sources? The contrast in spirit and character between the accounts would forbid any such derivation. The debased form may conceivably come from corruption of the higher, but not the reverse. The relation is one of cognateness, not of derivation. These traditions came down from a much older source, and are preserved by the Hebrews in their purer form.

Something must be said on the scientific and historical aspects of these narratives. Science is invoked to prove that the narratives of creation in Genesis 1, the story of man's origin and fall in chapters 2 and 3, the account of patriarchal longevity in chapters 5 and 11, the story of the deluge, and other matters, must all be rejected, because they are in open contradiction to the facts of modern knowledge. When science is said to contradict the Bible, what is meant by contradiction? The Bible was never given us in order to anticipate or forestall the discoveries of twentieth century science. The Bible, as every informed interpreter of Scripture has always held, takes the world as it is, and uses popular language appropriate to the common man, not the specialist. It does not follow that because the Bible does not teach modern science, we are justified in saying that it contradicts it. In these narratives of Genesis the standpoint of the author is so true, the illumination with which he is endowed so divine, his insight into the order of nature so unerring, that there is little, if anything, in his description that even yet, with our advanced knowledge, needs to be changed.

It would be well if those who speak of disagreement with science would look to the great truths embedded in these narratives which science may be called upon to confirm. There is, for example, (1) the truth that man is the last of God's created works, the crown of God's creation. Does science contradict that? (2) There is the great truth of the unity of the human race. No ancient people believed in such unity of the race, and at one time science cast doubts upon it. Does science contradict that? (3) There is the declaration that man was made in God's image. Does the science of man's nature contradict that? (4) The region of Babylonia is given as the very area of man's origin. Is this in contradiction with history? It lies outside the realm of science to contradict this.

In conclusion, it is clear that the narratives of creation, the fall, the flood, are not myths, but narratives containing the knowledge or memory of real transactions. The creation of the world was certainly not a myth, but a fact, and the representation of the different creative acts dealt likewise with facts. The language used was not that of modern science, but under divine guidance the sacred writer gives a broad, general picture which conveys a true idea of the order of the divine working in creation. Man's fall was also a tremendous fact with universal consequences in sin and death to the race. Man's origin can only be explained through an exercise of direct creative activity. The flood was an historical fact, and the preservation of Noah and his family is one of the best and most widely attested of human traditions. In these narratives in Genesis and the facts which they embody, is really laid the foundation of all else in the Bible. The unity of revelation binds them up with the Christian Gospel.

9

One Isaiah

By Professor George L. Robinson, D.D.

Formerly of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois

Revised by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

For more than two millenniums there was no serious doubt that Isaiah the son of Amoz was the author of every part of the book that bears his name. The Christian Church was unanimous on this matter, until certain German scholars more than a century and a half ago called the unity of the book into question. The critical disintegration of the Book of Isaiah began with Koppe, who in 1780 first doubted the genuineness of chapter 50. In 1789 Doederlein suspected the whole of chapters 40-66. He was followed by Rosenmueller, who was the first to deny to Isaiah the prophecy against Babylon in chapters 13 :1—14 :23. Eichhorn, at the beginning of the last century, further eliminated the oracle against Tyre in chapter 23, and with Gesenius and Ewald, also denied the Isaianic origin of chapters 24-27. Gesenius also ascribed to some unknown prophet chapters 15 and 16. Rosenmueller went further, and pronounced against chapters 34 and 35. Not long afterwards (1840), Ewald questioned chapters 12 and 33. Thus by the middle of the last century some thirty-seven or thirty-eight chapters were rejected as no part of Isaiah's actual writings.

In 1879-80 the celebrated Franz Delitzsch of Leipzig, who for years had defended the genuineness of the entire book, finally yielded to the modern critical position, and in the 1889 edition of his commentary interpreted chapters 40-66, though with much hesitation, as coming from the close of the period of the Babylonian exile. About the same time (1889-90) Driver and George Adam Smith gave popular impetus to similar views in Great Britain. Since 1890 the criticism of Isaiah has been even more microscopic than before. Duhm, Stade, Guthe, Hackmann, Cornill,

and Marti on the continent, and Cheyne, Whitehouse, Box, Glazebrook, Kennett, and others in Great Britain and America, have questioned portions which hitherto were supposed to be genuine.

Even the unity of chapters 40-66, which were supposed to be the work of the Second Isaiah, has been given up. What prior to 1890 was supposed to be the unique product of some celebrated but anonymous sage who lived in Babylonia in the sixth century B.C., is now commonly divided and subdivided, and in large part distributed among various writers from Cyrus to Simon. At first it was thought sufficient to separate chapters 63-66 as a later addition to "Deutero-Isaiah's" prophecies; but more recently it has become the fashion to distinguish between chapters 40-55, which are alleged to have been written in Babylonia about 549-538 B.C., and chapters 56-66, which are claimed to have been composed about 460-445 B.C. Some carry disintegration even farther than this, especially in the case of chapters 56-66, which are subdivided into various fragments, and said to be the product of a school of writers rather than a single pen. Opinions also conflict as to the place of their composition, whether in Babylonia, Palestine, Phoenicia, or Egypt.

The present state of the Isaiah question is complex and deadlocked. No important commentaries on Isaiah have appeared since 1900. Among those who deny the integrity of the book have been Driver, G. A. Smith, Skinner, Cheyne, Duhm, Guthe, Marti, Kennett, and more recently Pfeiffer with many others. Those who have defended the unity of Isaiah have been Naegelsbach, W. H. Green, Margoliouth, Robinson, Moeller, and more recently Allis, E. J. Young, Fitch, and others.

What is the basic reason for the dissection of the book? The fundamental axiom of criticism is the dictum that a prophet always spoke out of a definite historical situation to the present needs of the people among whom he lived, and that a definite historical situation should be pointed out for each prophecy. This fundamental postulate underlies all modern criticism of Old Testament prophecy. This principle on the whole is sound, but it can easily be overworked. Certain cautions are necessary: (1) It is impossible to trace each separate section of prophecy, independently of its context, to a definite historical situation. (2) It

is not necessarily the greatest event in a nation's history, or the event about which the most is known, that may actually have given birth, humanly speaking, to a particular prophecy. Israel's history is full of crises and events, any one of which may easily be claimed to furnish an appropriate, or at least a possible, background for a given prophecy. (3) The prophets usually spoke directly to the needs of their own day, but they spoke also to the generations yet to come. Isaiah commanded that his teachings be preserved for the future (8:16; 30:8; and 42:23).

When or how the Book of Isaiah was edited and brought into its present form is unknown. Jesus ben Sirach, the author of Ecclesiasticus, writing about 180 B.C., cites Isaiah as one of the notable worthies of Hebrew antiquity, in whose days, "the sun went backward and he added life to the king" (Ecclus. 48:20-25; cf. Isa. 38:4-8); and he adds, who "saw by an excellent spirit that which should come to pass at the last, and comforted them that mourned in Zion." Evidently, therefore, at the beginning of the second century B.C., at the latest, the Book of Isaiah had reached its present form, and the last twenty-seven chapters were already ascribed to the son of Amoz.

Furthermore, there is absolutely no proof that chapters 1-39, or any other considerable section of Isaiah's prophecies ever existed by themselves as an independent collection; nor is there any ground for thinking that the Messianic portions have been systematically interpolated by editors long subsequent to Isaiah's own time. The recently discovered Dead Sea Scrolls (1947) reveal no break between the former and latter portions of the Book of Isaiah.

Certain false presuppositions govern the critics in their disintegration of the Book of Isaiah. For one the conversion of the heathen (2:2-4) was beyond the horizon of an eighth century prophet; for another, the picture of universal peace (11:1-9) signifies a late date; for still another the concept of universal judgment (14:26) is beyond the range of Isaiah's thought; for yet another the apocalyptic nature of chapters 24-27 fits a time after Ezekiel. Radicals deny in toto the existence of Messianic passages among Isaiah's own predictions. But to deny to Isaiah of the eighth century all catholicity of grace, all universalism of salvation

or judgment, every highly developed Messianic ideal, every rich note of promise and comfort, all sublime faith in the sacred character of Zion, as some do, is unwarrantedly to create a new Isaiah of greatly reduced proportions, a statesman of not very optimistic vein though a preacher of righteousness, and the exponent of a cold ethical religion without the warmth and glow of the messages which are actually ascribed to the prophet of the eighth century.

The basic postulates of much criticism are unsound, and broad facts must decide the unity or collective character of Isaiah's book. To determine the exact historical background of each section is simply impossible, as the history of criticism plainly shows. Verbal exegesis may do more harm than good. Greater regard must be paid to the structure of the book. When treated as an organic whole, the book is a grand masterpiece. One great purpose dominates the author throughout, which is brought gradually to a climax in a picture of Israel's redemption and the glorification of Zion. Failure to recognize this unity incapacitates a man to do it exegetical justice. To regard the book as a heterogeneous mass of miscellaneous prophecies which were written at widely separated times and under varied circumstances from Isaiah's own period down to the Maccabean age, and freely interpolated throughout the intervening centuries, is to lose sight of the great historic realities and perspective of the prophet. In short, the whole problem of how much or how little Isaiah wrote would become immensely simplified if critics would only divest themselves of a mass of unwarranted presuppositions and arbitrary restrictions which fix hard and fast what each century can think and say.

There are, moreover, arguments that corroborate a belief that there was but one Isaiah. The circle of ideas is strikingly the same throughout. For example, take the name of God which is almost peculiar to the Book of Isaiah, "The Holy One of Israel." This title occurs in the Book of Isaiah a total of twenty-five times, and only six times elsewhere in the Old Testament. The presence of this divine name in all the different sections of the book (1:4; 10:20; 30:11, 12, 15; 45:11; 54:5; 60:9, 14) is of more value in identifying Isaiah as the author of all these prophecies, than if his name had been inscribed at the beginning

of every chapter, for the reason that his theology is woven into the very fiber and texture of the whole book. Another concept repeated in the book is that of a "remnant" (1:9; 11:11, 12, 16; 28:5; 46:3; 65:8, 9). Another is the position held by "Zion" in the prophet's thoughts (2:3; 24:23; 30:19; 34:8; 46:13; 52:1; 60:14; 62:1, 11; 65:11, 25; 66:8). These and others stamp the book psychologically with an individuality which it is difficult to account for, if it be broken up into various sections and distributed, as some do, over the centuries.

A second argument for one Isaiah is literary style. It is remarkable that the clause, "for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it," should be found three times in the Book of Isaiah, and nowhere else in the Old Testament (cf. 1:20; 40:5; 58:14). Most peculiar is the tendency on the part of the author to emphatic reduplication (cf. 2:7, 8; 40:1; 43:11; 51:12; 62:10). Isaiah's style differs widely from that of every other Old Testament prophet, and is as far removed as possible from that of Ezekiel and the post-exilic prophets.

Historical references are a third argument for unity of authorship. Take, for example, the prophet's constant reference to Judah and Jerusalem in 1:7-9; 5:13; 24:19; 40:2, 9; 62:4 also to the temple and its ritual of worship and sacrifice in 1:11-15; 43:23, 24; and 66:1-3, 6, 20. As for the exile, the prophet's attitude to it throughout is that of both anticipation and realization (cf. 57:1; 3:8; and 11:11, 12).

Finally, a fourth argument for one Isaiah is the predictive element. This is the strongest proof of the unity of the book. Prediction is the very essence of prophecy. Isaiah was pre-eminently a prophet of the future. With unparalleled suddenness he repeatedly leaps from despair to hope, from threat to promise, from the actual to the ideal. Isaiah spoke to his own age, but he also addressed himself to the ages to come. His verb tenses are characteristically futures and prophetic perfects. He was exceptionally given to predicting; thus, before the Syro-Ephraimitic War (734 B.C.) he foretold the fall of Ephraim (7:8) and the spoiling of Damascus and Samaria (8:4; cf. 7:16); before the downfall of Samaria in 722 B.C., he foretold the fate of Tyre (23:15); prior to the siege of Ashdod in 711 B.C. he predicted

judgment on Moab and Kedar (16:14; 21:16); not long before the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 B.C. he foretold the failure of the invasion (29:5) and the fall of Assyria (30:17, 31; 31:8). Repeatedly he pointed to predictions which he had already made in the earlier years of his ministry, and to the fact that they had been fulfilled (cf. 41:21-23, 26ff.; 42:9, 23; 43:9, 12; 44:7, 8, 27, 28; 45:1-4, 11, 21; 46:10, 11; and 48:3, 5, 6-8, 14-16).

From all these numerous explicit and oft-repeated predictions one thing is obvious, namely, that great emphasis is laid on prediction throughout the Book of Isaiah. Cyrus must be considered as predicted from any point of view. It really makes little difference at which end of history one stands, whether in the eighth century B.C. or in the sixth, Cyrus is the subject of prediction to the author of chapters 40-48. Whether, indeed, he is really predicting Cyrus in advance of all fulfilment, or whether Cyrus to him is the fulfilment of some ancient prediction, does not alter the fact that Cyrus was the subject of prediction on the part of somebody. If a decision must be made as to when Cyrus was actually predicted, it is obviously necessary to assume that he was predicted long before his actual appearance. This is in keeping with the test of prophecy in Deuteronomy 18:22. There is a similar prediction in the Old Testament: King Josiah was predicted by name more than two centuries before he came (I Kings 13:2). The very point of Isaiah's argument everywhere is that he is predicting events which God alone is capable of foretelling and bringing to pass; in other words, that prescience is the proof of Jehovah's deity.

Why should men object to prediction on so large a scale? Unless there is definiteness about any given prediction, unless it transcends ordinary prognostication, there is no special value in it. The only possible objection is that prediction of so minute a character is abhorrent to reason. But the answer to such an objection is already at hand; it may be abhorrent to reason, but it is certainly a handmaid to faith. Faith has to do with the future, even as prediction has to do with the future; and the Old Testament is preeminently a book which encourages faith.

The one outstanding differentiating characteristic of Israel's religion is predictive prophecy. Only the Hebrews ever predicted the coming of the Messiah of the kingdom of God. Accordingly to predict the coming of a Cyrus as the human agent of Israel's deliverance is but the reverse side of the same prophet's picture of the divine Agent, the obedient, suffering Servant of Jehovah, who would redeem Israel from their sin. Deny to Isaiah the son of Amoz the predictions concerning Cyrus, and the prophecy is robbed of its essential character and unique perspective; emasculate these latter chapters of Isaiah of their predictive feature, and they are reduced to a mere prediction after the event, and their religious value is largely lost.

10

The Book of Daniel

By Professor Joseph D. Wilson, D.D.

Theological Seminary of the Reformed Episcopal Church,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Abridged and emended by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

Modern objections to the Book of Daniel were started by scholars who were prejudiced against the supernatural. Daniel foretells events which have occurred in history. Therefore, these scholars argue, the alleged predictions must have been written after the events.

But the supernatural is not impossible, nor is it improbable, if sufficient reason for it exists in the purpose of God. It is not impossible, for instance, that an event so marvelous as the coming of the divine into humanity in the person of Jesus Christ should be predicted. So far from being impossible, it seems exceedingly probable; and furthermore, it seems not unreasonable that a prophet predicting a great and far distant event, like that mentioned above, should give some evidence to his contemporaries or immediate successors that he was a true prophet. Jeremiah foretold the seventy years captivity. Were his hearers warranted in believing that? Certainly. For he also foretold that all those lands would be subjected to the king of Babylon. A few years showed the latter prophecy to be true, and reasonable men believed the prediction of the seventy years exile.

Certain scholars have set forth an opinion that the Book of Daniel is a pious fraud. Others have tried to save something of the wreckage of the book, which has been the comfort and stay of suffering saints through the ages, by dwelling on its moral and religious teaching. Such apologists have done harm in fostering the idea that a fraud may be used for holy purposes, and that a forger is a proper teacher of religious truth.

These scholars find in Daniel 8, under the figure of a little horn, that Antiochus Epiphanes is predicted as persecuting the Jews. The vision is of the ram and he-goat which represent Persia and Greece, so specified by name. A notable horn of the he-goat, Alexander the Great, was broken, and in its place arose four horns, the four kingdoms into which the Greek Empire was divided. From one of these four came the little horn. That this refers primarily to Antiochus Epiphanes there is no doubt. He died about 163 B.C. The theory of the destructive critics is that some "pious and learned Jew" wrote the Book of Daniel at that time to encourage the Maccabees in their revolt against this evil king; that the book pretends to have been written in Babylon, some 370 years before, in order to pass it off as a revelation from God. This theory has been supported by numerous arguments, mostly conjectural and all without proof.

The imaginary Jew is termed "pious" because of the lofty religious ideas in the book, and "learned" because of his intimate acquaintance with the conditions and appointments of the Babylonian court four centuries before his day. But as no man, however learned, can write an extended history out of his imagination without some inaccuracies, the critics have searched diligently for mistakes. The chief of these alleged mistakes will be considered now.

We meet a difficulty at the threshold of the critical hypothesis. Daniel 9:26 foretells the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple; a calamity so frightful to the Jewish mind that the Greek translation of the Old Testament shrank from translating the Hebrew. What sort of encouragement was this? The hypothesis limps at the threshold.

Since Antiochus Epiphanes is predicted in chapter 8, the critics try to force him into chapter 7. They attempt to identify the little horn of chapter 7 with that of chapter 8. There is no resemblance between them. The little horn of chapter 7 springs up as an eleventh horn among *ten* kings. He is diverse from the other kings. He continues until the Son of Man comes in the clouds of heaven, and the kingdom which shall never be destroyed is set up. Antiochus Epiphanes, the little horn of chapter 8, comes out of one of the *four* horns into which

Alexander's kingdom resolved itself. He was not diverse from other kings, but was like scores of other evil monarchs, and he did not continue until the Son of Man.

These differences render the attempted identification impossible, but an examination of the two sets of prophecies in their entirety shows this clearly. Chapters 2 and 7 are a prophecy of world history until the millennial kingdom. Chapters 8 and 11 refer to a crisis in Jewish history, a crisis now long past.

Chapter 2 with its dream of the colossal image tells of four world-kindoms, to be succeeded by a number of sovereignties, some strong and some weak, continuing until the God of heaven would set up a kingdom never to be destroyed. Chapter 7 with the vision of the four beasts parallels chapter 2. The same four world-empires are in view; the fourth beast which is succeeded by ten kings continues until the coming of the Son of Man, who will set up an eternal kingdom. These four world-empires were Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome. There have been no other world-empires since. Efforts have been made to unite the different parts of the vision, but this is impossible.

These prophecies which are illustrated in every particular by history to the present time stand in the way of the theory. The Roman Empire must be eliminated to get rid of prediction, and any help to that end has been welcomed. Some critics make the kingdom of the Seleucidae, which was one of the parts of the Greek Empire, the fourth world-kingdom, but it never was a world-kingdom. It was part of the Greek Empire, one of the four heads of the leopard. Other critics create an imaginary Median Empire between Babylon and Persia. There was no such empire. The Medo-Persian Empire was one. Cyrus the Persian conquered Babylon. History says so and excavations confirm it.

The attempt of the little horn of chapter 8, Antiochus Epiphanes, to extirpate the true faith failed. Yet it was almost successful. Daniel's prophecy encouraged the faithful few to resist the Greek and their own faithless fellow countrymen. God foresaw and forewarned. The warning was unheeded by the mass of the Jews, but fortunately there was a believing remnant and the true faith was saved from extinction.

The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24-27. "Weeks" in this prophecy are not weeks of days but "sevens" or "heptads" of years. From the issuance of a commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem unto Messiah there would be 69 sevens, i.e., 483 years. Messiah would be cut off and have nothing, and the people and their prince would destroy Jerusalem and the temple. It came to pass in the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate. Messiah appeared; he was cut off; he had nothing of his rightful kingdom on David's throne. And before that generation passed away, the Romans destroyed the city and sanctuary, and scattered the Jewish nation, bringing to an end their political economy. Unto Messiah the Prince there were to be 483 years from the edict to rebuild Jerusalem. That decree was issued in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, about 445 B.C. The 483 years terminated in the time of Pontius Pilate, who governed from 26 A.D. to 36 A.D.

All this is plain enough, and if the words of Daniel had been written after the death of our Saviour and the fall of Jerusalem, no one could fail to see that the Lord Jesus Christ is indicated. But if written in the exile, this would be supernatural prediction, hence the struggles to evade somehow the implications of the passage. To find some prominent person who was "cut off" before 163 B.C. was the first requirement. The highpriest Onias, who was murdered through his rivals for office, was the most suitable person. He was in no sense the Messiah, but having been anointed he might be made to serve. He died 171 B.C. The next step was to find an edict to rebuild Jerusalem, 483 years before 171 B.C. That date was 654 B.C. during the reign of Manasseh, son of Hezekiah. No decree could be found there. But by deducting 49 years, the date was brought to 605 B.C., and since in that year Jeremiah had foretold (Jer. 25:9) the destruction of Jerusalem, perhaps this would do.

There were two objections to this view; one, that a prophecy of desolation to the city and sanctuary then in existence was not a commandment to restore and rebuild, and the other objection was that this also was a supernatural prediction, and as such, not acceptable to the critics. So recourse was had to the decree of Cyrus (Ezra 1:1-4) made in 536 B.C. But Cyrus' decree authorized,

not the building of Jerusalem, but the temple. Nor is it likely that a wise king like Cyrus would have permitted a fortified city to be built in a remote corner of his empire close to his enemy, Egypt, with which the Jews had frequently plotted in previous years. The city was not restored until the twentieth year of Artaxerxes (Neh. 2:3, 8, 13). Permission to build could safely be given then, for Egypt had been conquered, and the loyalty of the Jews to Persia had been tested. Moreover, the date of Cyrus' decree does not meet the conditions. From 536 B.C. to 171 B.C. is 365 years and not 483. A "learned and pious Jew" would not have made such a blunder in arithmetic when foisting a forgery on his countrymen.

There were four decrees concerning Jerusalem issued by the Persian court. The first under Cyrus, mentioned above, the second under Darius Hystaspis (Ezra 6). The third in the seventh year of Artaxerxes (Ezra 7:12-26). All of these concern the temple. The fourth in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes was the only one to restore and rebuild a walled town.

Supposed Inaccuracies

The critical interpretations of the aforementioned prophecies are so unnatural, that they place a heavy strain on our credulity. Accordingly, attempts have been made to discredit the Book of Daniel by showing it could not have been written in Babylon, and by disclosing historical inaccuracies. The alleged inaccuracies can be shown to confirm the historical accuracy and reliability of the book.

(1) First, there may be mentioned the fact that no historian mentions Belshazzar. It was assumed that the name had been invented. Excavations have shown beyond a doubt that Belshazzar lived in Babylon.

(2) Fault is found with the title "king" which Daniel gives to Belshazzar; it is asserted that no tablets have been found dated in his reign. Since Belshazzar was co-regent with his father, his father's name would be in the dates. He was the heir to the throne, and even if not formally invested, was the virtual king in the eyes of the people.

(3) It is contended that Belshazzar was not the son of Nebuchadnezzar as is stated in Daniel 5:11. If he were the grandson through his mother, the same language would be used, and the undisturbed reign of Nabonidus, his father, is accounted for in this way.

(4) The critics have attacked Daniel's mention of the "Chaldeans" as a guild of wise men. The claim is that only four centuries after Daniel's time did the term signify a guild. Herodotus visited Babylon, and used the word in the same sense as Daniel and in no other (Herod. 1:181, 185).

(5) As to the Greek words in Daniel, relied on by Driver to prove a late date, when we find that these are the names of musical instruments, and that the Babylonians knew the Greeks in war and commerce, and realize that musical instruments carry their native names with them, this argument vanishes like the rest.

(6) It is urged that Daniel begins the captivity (1:1) in the third year of Jehoiakim, 606 B.C., whereas Jerusalem was not destroyed until 587 B.C. But Daniel dates the captivity, which was in three invasions and three deportations, from the time that he and his friends were carried away. The seventy years captivity were reckoned from the first deportation, and Daniel tells us when that was. The captivity ended in 536 B.C.

(7) The Aramaic. Some have claimed Aramaic was not spoken in Babylon; others, that the Aramaic of Babylon was different from that of Daniel. In 1906 and 1908 papyri in Aramaic from the fifth century B.C. were unearthed. They disclose Aramaic was the common language of the people, the very language which the frightened Chaldeans used when their angry king threatened them (Dan. 2:4).

Daniel was a wise and well-known man in the time of Ezekiel, else all point in the irony of Ezekiel 28:3 is lost. He was also eminent for piety and esteemed as a channel of the divine revelation (Ezekiel 14:14, 20). A striking collocation this: Noah the second father of the race, Job the Gentile, and Daniel the Jew.

Daniel is better attested than any other book of the Old Testament. Ezekiel mentions him; Zechariah appears to have read the book; and our Savior recognized Daniel as a prophet (Matt. 24:15). These are sufficient attestations.

11

The Doctrinal Value of the First Chapters of Genesis

By the Rev. Dyson Hague, M.A.

Vicar of the Church of the Epiphany; Professor of Liturgics,
Wycliffe College, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Revised by Gerald B. Stanton, Th.D.

I. GENESIS — THE FOUNDATION FOR ALL SCRIPTURE

The Book of Genesis is in many respects the most important book in the Bible. It is of the first importance because it answers, not exhaustively, but sufficiently, the fundamental questions of the human mind. It contains the first authoritative information given to the race concerning these questions of everlasting interest: the being of God; the origin of the universe; the creation of man; the origin of the soul; the fact of revelation; the introduction of sin; the promise of salvation; the primitive division of the human race; the out-calling of Israel and the preliminary part of God's redemptive program. In one word, in this inspired volume of beginnings, we have the satisfactory explanation of all the sin and misery and contradiction now in this world, and the reason of the scheme of redemption.

Or, let us put it another way. The Book of Genesis is the seed in which the plant of God's Word is enfolded. It is the starting point of God's gradually-unfolded plan of the ages. Genesis is the plinth of the pillar of the Divine revelation. It is the root of the tree of the inspired Scriptures. It is the source of the stream of the holy writings of the Bible. If the base of the pillar is removed, the pillar falls. If the root of the tree is cut out, the tree will wither and die. If the fountain head of the stream is cut off, the stream will dry up. The Bible as a whole is like a chain hanging upon two staples. The Book of Genesis is the one staple; the Book of Revelation is the other. Take away either staple and the chain falls in confusion. If the first chapters

of Genesis are unreliable, then the revelation of the beginning of the universe, the origin of the race, and the reason for its redemption are gone. If the last chapters of Revelation are displaced, the consummation of all things is unknown. If you take away Genesis, you have lost the explanation of the first heaven, the first earth, the first Adam, and the fall. If you take away Revelation you have lost the completed truth of the new heaven, and the new earth, man redeemed, and the second Adam in Paradise regained.

Furthermore, in the first chapters of the Book of Genesis, you have the strong and sufficient foundation of the subsequent developments of the kingdom of God; the root-germ of all Anthropology, Soteriology, Christology, Satanology, to say nothing of the ancient and modern problems of the mystery and culpability of sin, the unity of the race, and God's establishment of matrimony and family life.

We assume from the start the historicity of Genesis and its Mosaic authorship. It was evidently accepted by our infallible Lord Jesus Christ as historical, as one single composition, and as the work of Moses. It was accepted by Paul, who wrote under the inspiration of the Spirit, and by the divinely appointed leaders of God's chosen people. It has validated itself to God's people throughout the ages by its realism and consistency, and by what has been finely termed its subjective truthfulness. We postulate especially the historicity of the first chapters. These are not only valuable, they are vital. They are the essence of Genesis.

The Book of Genesis is neither the work of a theorist nor of a tribal annalist. It is still less the product of some anonymous compiler or compilers in some unknowable era, of a series of myths, historic in form but unhistoric in fact. Its opening is an apocalypse, a direct revelation from the God of all truth. Whether it was given in a vision or otherwise, it is impossible to say. But it is possible, if not probable, that the same Lord God, who revealed to his servant as he was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day the apocalypse of the humanly unknown and unknowable events of man's history which will transpire when this heaven and this earth have passed away, would also have revealed to his servant, being in the Spirit, the apocalypse of the humanly unknowable and

unknown events which transpired before this earth's history began. It has been asserted that the beginning and the end of things are both absolutely hidden from science. Science has to do with phenomena. It is where science must confess its impotence that revelation steps in, and, with the authority of God, reveals those things that are above it. The beginning of Genesis, therefore, is a divinely inspired narrative of the events deemed necessary by God to establish the foundations for the Divine Law in the sphere of human life, and to set forth the relation between the omnipotent Creator and the man who fell, and the race that was to be redeemed by the incarnation of his Son.

The German rationalistic idea, which has passed over into thousands of more or less orthodox Christian minds, is that these earliest chapters embody ancient traditions of the Semitic-oriental mind. Others go farther, and not only deny them to be the product of the reverent and religious mind of the Hebrew, but assert they were simply oriental legends, not born from above and of God, but born in the East, and probably in pagan Babylonia.

We would therefore postulate the following propositions:

1. The Book of Genesis has no doctrinal value if it is not authoritative.
2. The Book of Genesis is not authoritative if it is not true. For if it is not history, it is not reliable; and if it is not revelation, it is not authoritative.
3. The Book of Genesis is not true if it is not from God. For if it is not from God, it is not inspired; and if it is not inspired, it possesses to us no doctrinal value whatever.
4. The Book of Genesis is not direct from God if it is a heterogeneous compilation of mythological folklore by unknowable writers.
5. If the Book of Genesis is a legendary narrative, anonymous, indefinitely erroneous, and the persons it described the mere mythical personifications of tribal genius, it is of course not only non-authentic, because non-authenticated, but an insufficient basis for doctrine. The residuum of dubious truth, which might with varying degrees of consent be extracted therefrom, could never be accepted as a foundation for the superstructure of eternally

trustworthy doctrine, for it is an axiom that that only is of doctrinal value which is God's Word. Mythical and legendary fiction, and still more, erroneous and misleading tradition, are incompatible not only with the character of the God of all truth, but with the truthfulness, trustworthiness, and absolute authority of the Word of God. We have not taken for our credentials cleverly invented myths. The primary documents, if there were such, were collated and revised and rewritten by Moses acting under the inspiration of God.

A sentence in Margoliouth's *Lines of Defence* deserves an attentive consideration today. We should have some opportunity, said the Oxford professor, of gauging the skill of those on whose faith the old-fashioned belief in the authenticity of Scripture has been abandoned (p. 293). One would perhaps prefer to put the idea in this way. Our modern Christians should have more opportunity not only of appraising the skill, but of gauging also the spiritual qualifications of a critical school that has been characterized notoriously by an enthusiasm against the miraculous, and a precipitate adoption of any conclusion from a rationalistic source which militates against the historicity of Genesis.

Christians are conceding too much nowadays to the agnostic scientist, and the rationalistic Hebraist, and are often to blame if they allow them to go out of their specific provinces without protest. Their assumptions ought to be watched with the utmost vigilance and jealousy (cf. Gladstone, *The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*, pp. 62-83).

But to resume. The Book of Genesis is the foundation on which the superstructure of the Scriptures rests. The foundation of the foundation is in the first three chapters, which form in themselves a complete monograph of revelation. And of this final substructure, the first three verses of the first chapter are the foundation.

In the first verse of Genesis, in words of supernatural grandeur, we have a revelation of God as the first cause, the Creator of the universe, the world and man. The glorious Being of God comes forth without explanation, and without apology. It is a revelation of the one, personal, living God. There is in the ancient philosophic cosmogony no trace of the idea of such a Being, still less

of such a Creator, for all other systems began and ended with pantheistic, materialistic, or hylozoistic conceptions. The divine Word stands unique in declaring the absolute idea of the living God, without attempt at demonstration. The spirituality, infinity, omnipotence, sanctity of the Divine Being, all in germ lie here. Nay more. The later and more fully revealed doctrine of the unity of God in the Trinity may be said to lie here in germ also.

The fact of God in the first of Genesis is not given as a deduction of reason or a philosophic generalization. It is a revelation. It is a revelation of that primary truth which is received by the universal human mind as a truth that needs no proof, and is incapable of it, but which being received, is verified to the intelligent mind by an irresistible force, not only with ontological and cosmological, but with teleological and moral arguments. Here we have in this first verse of Genesis, not only a postulate apart from Revelation, but three great truths which have constituted the glory of our religion.

(1) The unity of God, in contradiction to all the polytheisms and dualisms of ancient and modern pagan philosophy.

(2) The personality of God, in contradiction to that pantheism whether materialistic or idealistic, which recognizes God's immanence in the world, but denies His transcendence. For in all its multitudinous developments, pantheism has this peculiarity, that it denies the personality of God, and excludes from the realm of life the need of a Mediator, a Sin-Bearer, and a personal Saviour.

(3) The omnipotence of God, in contradiction, not only to those debasing conceptions of the anthropomorphic deities of the ancient world, but to all those man-made idols which the millions of heathenism today adore. God made these stars and suns, which man in his infatuation fain would worship. Thus in contradiction to all human conceptions and human evolutions, there stands forth no mere deistic abstraction, but the one, true, living and only God. He is named by the name Elohim, the name of divine majesty, the Adorable One, our Creator and Governor; the same God who in a few verses later is revealed as Jehovah-Elohim, Jehovah being the covenant name, the God of revelation and grace, the ever-existent Lord, the God and Father of us all (Green, *Unity of Genesis*, pp. 31, 32; *Fausset's Bib. Ency.*, p. 258).

One of the theories of modernism is that the law of evolution can be traced through the Bible in the development of the idea of God. The development of the idea of God? Is there in the Scriptures any real trace of the development of the idea of God? There is an expansive and richer and fuller revelation of the attributes and dealings and ways and workings of God, but not of the idea of God. The God of Genesis 1:1 is the God of Psalm 90, of Isaiah 40:28, of Hebrews 1:1, and Revelation 4:11.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Here in a sublime revelation is the doctrinal foundation of the creation of the universe, and the contradiction of the ancient and modern conceptions of the eternity of matter. God only is eternal.

One can well believe the story of a Japanese thinker who took up a strange book, and with great wonder read the first sentence: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." It struck him that there was more philosophy of a theological character, satisfying to the mind and soul, in that one sentence than in all the sacred books of the orient.

That single sentence separates the Scriptures from the rest of human productions. The wisest philosophy of the ancients, Platonic, Aristotelian or Gnostic, never reached the point that the world was created by God in the sense of absolute creation. In no cosmogony outside of the Bible is there a record of the idea that God created the heaven and the earth, as an effort of his will, and the fiat of his eternal, self-existent Personality. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*. The highest point reached by their philosophical speculations was a kind of atomic theory; of cosmic atoms and germs and eggs possessed of some inexplicable forces of development, out of which the present cosmos was through long ages evolved. Matter was almost universally believed to have existed from eternity. The Bible teaches that the universe was not self caused, nor a mere passive evolution of his nature, nor a mere transition from one form of being to another, from non-being to being, but that it was a direct creation of the personal, living, working God who created all things out of nothing by the fiat of his will, and the instrumentality of the eternal Logos. In glorious contrast to agnostic science with its lamentable creed, "I believe that behind and above and around the phenomena of matter and force remains

the unsolved mystery of the universe," the Christian holds forth his triumphant solution, "I believe that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (John 1:1-3; Heb. 1:1; Col. 1:16). The first verse of the Bible is a proof that the Book is of God.

And so with regard to the subsequent verses. Genesis is admittedly not a statement of scientific history. It is a narrative for mankind to show that this world was made by God for the habitation of man, and was gradually made fit for God's children. So in a series of successive creative developments from the formless chaos, containing in embryonic condition all elemental constituents, chemical and mechanical, air, earth, fire, and water, the sublime process is recorded according to the Genesis narrative in the following order:

1. The creation by direct divine act of matter in its gaseous, aqueous, terrestrial and mineral condition successively (Gen. 1:1-10; cf. Col. 1:16; Heb. 11:3).

2. The emergence by divine creative power of the lowest forms of sea and land life (Gen. 1:11-13).

3. The creation by direct divine act of larger forms of life, aquatic and terrestrial; the great sea monsters and gigantic reptiles, the *sheretjim* and *tanninim* (cf. Dawson, *Origin of the World*, p. 213; Gen. 1:20-21.)

4. The emergence by divine creative power of land animals of higher organization, herbivora and smaller mammals and carnivora (Gen. 1:24-25).

5. Finally, the creation of man by a direct divine act (Gen. 1:26-27). Not first, but last. The last for which the first was made, as Browning so finely puts it. Herein is the compatability of Genesis and science, for this sublime order is just the order that some of the foremost of the nineteenth and twentieth century scientists have proclaimed. It is remarkable, too, that the word for absolutely new creation is only used in connection with the introduction of life (Gen. 1:1, 2, 27). These three points where the idea of absolute creation is introduced are the three main points at which modern champions of evolution find it impossible to make their connection.

II. THE BEGINNING OF MANKIND

Next we have in this sublime revelation the doctrinal foundation for the beginning of mankind. Man was created, not evolved. That is, he did not come from protoplasmic mud-mass, or sea-ooze bathybian, or by descent from fish or frog, or horse, or ape; but at once, direct, full made, did man come forth from God. When you read what some writers, professedly religious, say about man and his bestial origin, your shoulders unconsciously droop, your head hangs down, your heart feels sick. Your self-respect has received a blow. When you read Genesis, your shoulders straighten, your chest emerges. You feel proud to be that thing that is called man. Up goes your heart, and up goes your head. The Bible stands openly against the evolutionary development of man, and his gradual ascent through indefinite aeons from the animal. It does not stand against the idea of the development of the plans of the Creator in nature, or a variation of species by means of environment and processes of time. That is seen in Genesis and throughout the Bible, and in this world. But the Bible does stand plainly against that garish theory that all species, vegetable and animal, have originated through evolution from lower forms through long natural processes. The materialistic form of this theory to the Christian is most offensive. It practically substitutes an all-engendering protoplasmic cell for the only and true God. But even the theistic-supernaturalistic theory is opposed to the Bible and to science for these reasons:

1. There is no such universal law of development. On the contrary, scientific evidence is now standing for deterioration. The flora and the fauna of the latest period show no trace of improvement, and even man, proud man, from the biological and physiological standpoint has gained nothing to speak of from the dawn of history. The earliest archaeological remains of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, show no trace of slow emergence from barbarism. That species can be artificially improved is true, but that is not transmutation of species (Dawson, *Origin of the World*, pp. 227-277).

2. No new type has even been discovered. Science is universally proclaiming the truth of Genesis 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25 "after his kind," "after their kind," that is, species by species. Geology with its five hundred or so species of ganoids proclaims the fact

of the non-transmutation of species. If, as they say, the strata tell the story of countless aeons, it is strange that during those countless aeons the trilobite never produced anything but a trilobite, nor has the ammonite ever produced anything but an ammonite. The elaborately artificial exceptions of modern science only confirm the rule (cf. Townsend, *Collapse of Evolution*).

3. Nor is there any trace of transmutation of species. Man develops from a single cell, and the cell of a monkey is said to be indistinguishable from that of a man. But the fact that a man cell develops into a man and the monkey cell develops into a monkey, shows there is an immeasurable difference between them. And the development from a cell into a man has nothing whatever to do with the evolution of one species into another. "To science, species are practically unchangeable units" (*Origin of the World*, p. 227). Man is the sole species of his genus, and the sole representative of his species. The abandonment of any original type is said to be soon followed by the complete extinction of the family.

4. Nor has the missing link been found. The late Robert Etheridge of the British Museum, head of the geological department, and one of the ablest of British paleontologists, has said: "In all that great museum there is not a particle of evidence of transmutation of species. Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is not founded on observation, and is wholly unsupported by facts." And Professor Virchow is said to have declared with vehemence regarding evolution: "It's all nonsense. You are as far as ever you were from establishing any connection between man and the ape" (or, as more recently asserted, between man and a "common ancestor" with the ape). A great gulf is fixed between the theory of evolution and the sublime statement of Genesis 1:26, 27. These verses give man his true place in the universe as the consummation of creation. Made out of the dust of the ground, and created on the same day with the highest group of animals, man has physiological affinities with the animal creation. But he was made in the image of God, and is therefore transcendently superior to any animal. "Man is a walker, the monkey is a climber," said the great French scientist, De Quatrefages, years ago. A man does a thousand things every day that a monkey could not do if he tried ten thousand years. Man has the designing, controlling, ordering,

constructive, and governing faculties. Man has personality, understanding, will, conscience. Man is fitted for apprehending God and for worshipping God. The Genesis account of man is the only possible basis of revelation. The revelation of fatherhood; of the beautiful, the true, the good; of purity, of peace; is unthinkable to a horse, a dog, or a monkey. The most civilized simian could have no affinity with such conceptions, or of receiving them if revealed.

It is, moreover, the only rational basis for the doctrine of regeneration in opposition to the idea of the evolution of the human character, and of the great doctrine of the incarnation. Man once made in the image of God, by the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost is born again and made in the image of God the Son.

III. DOCTRINAL FOUNDATIONS IN GENESIS

Further, we have in this sublime revelation of Genesis the doctrinal foundation of: (1) The unity of the human race, (2) the fall of man, and (3) the plan of redemption.

(1) The unity of the human race. With regard to this unity, Sir William Dawson has said that the Bible knows but one Adam. Adam was not a myth, or an ethnic name. He was a veritable man, made by God; not an evolutionary development from some hairy anthropoid in some imaginary continent of Lemuria. The Bible knows but one species of man, one primitive pair. This is confirmed by the Lord Jesus Christ in Matthew 19:4. It is reaffirmed by Paul in Acts 17:26, whichever reading may be taken, and in Romans 5:12; I Corinthians 15:21, 47, 49. Nor is there any ground for supposing that the word Adam is used in a collective sense, and thus leave room for the hypotheses of the evolutionary development of a large number of human pairs. All things in both physiology and ethnology, as well as in the sciences, which bear on the subject confirm the idea of the unity of the human race.

(2) The fall of man. The foundation of all Hamartiology and Anthropology (doctrines of sin and of man) lies in the first three chapters of Genesis. It teaches us that man was originally created for communion with God, and that whether his personality was dichotomistic or trichotomistic, he was entirely fitted for personal, intelligent fellowship with his Maker, and was united with him in

the bonds of love and knowledge. Every element of the Bible story recommends itself as a historic narrative. Placed in Eden by his God, with a work to do, and a trial-command, man was potentially perfect, but with the possibility of fall. Man fell by disobedience, and through the power of a supernatural deceiver called that old serpent, the devil and Satan, who from Genesis 3 to Revelation 19 appears as the implacable enemy of the human race, and the head of that fallen angel-band which abandoned through the sin of pride their first principality.

This story is incomprehensible if only a myth. The great Dutch theologian Van Oosterzee says, "The narrative presents itself plainly as history. Such an historico-fantastic clothing of a pure philosophic idea accords little with the genuine spirit of Jewish antiquity" (*Dogmatics, II*, p. 403).

Still more incomprehensible is it, if it is merely an allegory which refers fruit, serpent, woman, tree, eating, etc., to entirely different things from those mentioned in the Bible. It is history. It is treated as such by our Lord Jesus Christ, who surely would not mistake a myth for history, and by St. Paul, who hardly built Romans 5 and I Corinthians 15, on cleverly composed fables. It is the only satisfactory explanation of the corruption of the race. From Adam's time death has reigned.

This story of the fall stands, moreover, as a barrier against all Manicheism, and against that Pelagianism which declares that man is not so bad after all, and derides the doctrine of original sin which in all our Church confessions distinctly declares the possession by every one from birth of this sinful nature. The penalty and horror of sin, the corruption of our human nature, and the hopelessness of our sinful estate are things definitely set forth in the Holy Scripture, and are St. Paul's divinely inspired deductions from this fact of the incoming of sin and death through the disobedience and fall of Adam, the original head of the human race. The race is in a sinful condition (Rom. 5:12). Mankind is a solidarity. As the root of a tree lives in stem, branch, leaf and fruit; so in Adam, as Anselm says, a person made nature sinful, in his posterity nature made persons sinful. Or, as Pascal finely puts it, original sin is folly in the sight of man, but this

folly is wiser than all the wisdom of man, for without it who could have said what man is. His whole condition depends upon this imperceptible point (*Thoughts*, Ch. 13, 11). This Genesis story further is the foundation of the Scripture doctrine of all human responsibility and accountability to God. A lowered anthropology always means a lowered theology, for if man was not a direct creation of God, if he was a mere indirect development, through slow and painful process, of no one knows what, or how, or why, or when, or where, the main spring of moral accountability is gone. The fatalistic conception of man's personal and moral life is the deadly gift of naturalistic evolution to our age.

(3) The plan of redemption. With regard to our redemption, the third chapter of Genesis is the basis of all Soteriology (doctrine of salvation). If there was no fall there was no condemnation, no separation and no need of reconciliation. If there was no need of reconciliation, there was no need of redemption; and if there was no need of redemption, the Incarnation was a superfluity, and the crucifixion folly (Gal. 3:21). So closely does the apostle link the fall of Adam and the death of Christ, that without Adam's fall the science of theology is evacuated of its most salient feature, the atonement. If the first Adam was not made a living soul and fell, there was no reason for the work of the Second Man, the Lord from heaven. The rejection of the Genesis story as a myth, tends to the rejection of the Gospel of salvation. One of the chief cornerstones of the Christian doctrine is removed, if the historical reality of Adam and Eve is abandoned, for the fall will ever remain as the starting point of special revelation, of salvation by grace, and of the need of personal regeneration. In it lies the germ of the entire apostolic Gospel.

Finally, we have in Genesis 2 the doctrinal foundation of those great fundamentals, the necessity of labor and for a day of rest, the divine ordinance of matrimony, and the home life of mankind. The weekly day of rest was provided for man by his God, and is planted in the very forefront of the home. Our Lord Jesus Christ endorses the Mosaic story of the creation of Adam and Eve, refers to it as the explanation of the divine will regarding divorce, and sanctions by his infallible imprimatur that most momentous of ethical questions, monogamy. Thus the great elements of life

as God intended it, the three universal factors of happy, healthy, helpful life, law, labor, love, are laid down in the beginning of God's Book.

IV. OTHER IMPORTANT ISSUES IN GENESIS

Three other remarkable features in the first chapters of Genesis deserve a brief reference.

The first is the assertion of the original unity of the language of the human race (Gen. 11:1). Max Muller, a foremost ethnologist and philologist, declares that all our languages, in spite of their diversities, must have originated in one common source (cf. Saphir, *Divine Unity*, p. 206; Dawson, *Origin of the World*, p. 286; Guinness, *Divine Programme*, p. 75).

The second is that miracle of ethnological prophecy by Noah in Genesis 9:26, 27, in which we have foretold in a sublime epitome the three great divisions of the human race, and their ultimate historic destinies. The three great divisions, Hamitic, Shemitic, and Japhetic, are the three ethnic groups into which modern science has divided the human race. The facts of history have fulfilled what was foretold in Genesis four thousand years ago. The Hamitic nations, including the Chaldean, Babylonian, and Egyptian, have been degraded, profane, and sensual. The Shemitic have been the religious with the line of the coming Messiah. The Japhetic have been the enlarging and the dominant races, including all the great world monarchies, both of the ancient and modern times, the Grecian, Roman, Gothic, Celtic, Teutonic, British and American, and by recent investigation and discovery, the races of India, China, and Japan. Thus Ham lost all empire centuries ago; Shem and his race acquired it ethically and spiritually through the Prophet, Priest and King, the Messiah; while Japheth, in world-embracing enlargement and imperial supremacy, has stood for industrial, commercial, and political dominion.

The third is the glorious promise given to Abraham, the man to whom the God of glory appeared and in whose seed, personal and incarnate, the whole world was to be blessed. Abraham's spiritual experience with God is the explanation of the monotheism of the three greatest religions in the world. He stands out in majestic proportion, as Max Muller says, as a figure, second only to One in the whole world's history. Apart from that promise the

miraculous history of the Hebrew race is inexplicable. In him centers, and on him hangs, the central fact of the whole of the Old Testament, the promise of the Saviour and his glorious salvation (Gen. 12:3, 22:18; Gal. 3:8-16).

In an age, therefore, when the critics are waxing bold in claiming settledness for the assured results of their hypothetic eccentricities, Christians should wax bolder in contending earnestly for the assured results of the revelation of God as it is found in the opening chapters of Genesis.

The attempt of modernism to save the supernatural in the second part of the Bible by mythicalizing the supernatural in the first part, is as unwise as it is fatal. Instead of lowering the dominant of faith amidst the chorus of doubt, and admitting that a chapter is doubtful because some *doctinaire* has questioned it, or a doctrine is less authentic because somebody has floated an unverifiable hypothesis, it would be better to take our stand with such men as Romanes, Lord Kelvin, Virchow, and Liebig, in their ideas of a Creative Power, and to side with Cuvier, the eminent French scientist, who said that Moses, while brought up in all the science of Egypt, was superior to his age, and has left us a cosmogony the exactitude of which verifies itself every day in a reasonable manner; with Sir William Dawson, the eminent Canadian scientist, who declared that Scripture in all its details contradicts no received result of science, but anticipates many of its discoveries; with Professor Dana, the eminent American scientist, who said, after examining the first chapters of Genesis as a geologist, "I find it to be in perfect accord with known science"; or best of all, with him who said, "Had you believed Moses, you would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if you believe not his writings, how shall you believe my words?" (John 5:45, 46).

12

The Testimony of Archaeology to the Scriptures

Being the chapter on

"The Testimony of the Monuments to the Truth of the Scriptures"

By Prof. George F. Wright, D.D., LL.D.

Oberlin College

and the chapter on

"The Recent Testimony of Archaeology to the Scriptures"

By M. G. Kyle, D.D., LL.D.

President, Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary

Revised by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

All history is fragmentary. Each particular fact is the center of a great complex of circumstances. No man has intelligence enough to insert a hypothetical fact into circumstances not belonging to it, and make it fit exactly. This only infinite intelligence can do. A successful forgery, therefore, is impossible, if we have a sufficient number of the original circumstances with which to compare it. It is this principle which gives such importance to the examination of witnesses. If the witness is truthful, the more he is questioned the more accurately will his testimony be seen to accord with the framework of circumstances into which it is fitted. If false, the more will his falsehood become apparent.

Remarkable opportunities for cross-examining the Old Testament have been afforded by the uncovering of long-buried monuments in Bible lands and by the deciphering of the inscriptions on them. It is the purpose of this chapter to give the results of a sufficient portion of this examination to afford a reasonable test of the competence and honesty of the historians of the Old Testament, and of the faithfulness with which their record has been transmitted to us. The limitations of space will not permit more than a sampling of the vast evidence now available to us.

The Identification of Belshazzar

Attention is being centered first on one of the Old Testament narratives against which some of the harshest judgments of modern critics have been hurled. We refer to the statements in the Book of Daniel concerning the person and career of Belshazzar. In the fifth chapter of Daniel Belshazzar is called the son of Nebuchadnezzar, and is said to have been king of Babylon and to have been slain on the night the city was captured. Some historians have denied the historical character of Belshazzar altogether; according to others he was the son of Nabonidus, who was then king, and who is known to have been out of the city when it was taken, and to have lived some time afterwards. Here is a glaring discrepancy, a flat contradiction between profane and sacred historians. But in 1854 Sir Henry Rawlinson found, while excavating the ruins of ancient Ur, inscriptions which stated that Nabonidus (Nabunaid) associated with him on his throne his eldest son, Bel-shar-usur, and allowed him the royal title, thus making it credible that Belshazzar should have been in Babylon, as he is said to have been in the Bible, and that he should have been called king, and that he should have perished in the city while Nabonidus survived outside the realm. For a number of years Nabonidus busied himself with campaigns in the city of Tema, Arabia. That Belshazzar should have been called king while his father was still living is no more strange than that Jehoram should have been appointed by his father, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, seven years before his father's death (II Kings 1:17; 8:16), or that Jotham should have been made king before his father, Uzziah, died of leprosy, though Uzziah is still called king in some of the references to him.

That Belshazzar should have been called son of Nebuchadnezzar is readily accounted for on the supposition that he was his grandson, and there are many things to indicate that Nabonidus married Nebuchadnezzar's daughter in order to consolidate his position as a usurper of the throne. If this view be rejected, there is the natural supposition that in the loose use of terms of relationship common in the Orient, "son" might be applied to one who was simply a successor. In the inscriptions on the monuments of Shalmaneser III, Jehu, the extirpator of the house of Omri, is called the "son of Omri." The status of Belshazzar is confirmed

incidentally by the fact that Daniel is promised in 5:6 the "third" place in the kingdom, and in 5:29 is given that place, all of which implies that Belshazzar was second only. Thus, what was formerly thought to be an insuperable objection to the historical accuracy of the Book of Daniel proves to be a mark of accuracy. The coincidences are all the more remarkable for being so evidently undesigned.

The Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser

From various inscriptions we are now able to trace the movements of Shalmaneser III (858-824) through most of his career. A few years after his accession to the Assyrian throne, an important battle was waged at Karkar on the Orontes against a strong coalition of twelve kings. The "Monolith Inscription" of Shalmaneser III describes this battle. Among the kings of the coalition appears the name of "Ahab, the Israelite," an attestation to the prominence of Ahab among the rulers of his day. On a later campaign of Shalmaneser III, Jehu of Israel was compelled to pay him heavy tribute. This is recorded on the famous Black Obelisk found by Layard in 1846 in Shalmaneser's palace at Nimrod. Thus archaeology bears witness to the historicity of these Israelite kings.

The Moabite Stone

One of the most important discoveries for the Old Testament is that of the Moabite Stone, discovered at Dibon, east of the Jordan, in 1868, which was set up by King Mesha (about 850 B.C.) to commemorate his deliverance from the yoke of Omri, king of Israel. The inscription is valuable, among other things, for its witness to the plane of civilization of the Moabites at that time, and to the close similarity of their language to that of the Hebrews. On comparing the Moabite account with II Kings 3:4-27, we find an account which parallels and supplements the biblical narrative in a remarkable way.

The Expedition of Shishak

Shishak (Sheshonk of the Egyptians and the founder of the Libyan Dynasty) is the first name of an Egyptian king to be found in Scripture (I Kings 11:40). Taking advantage of the disruption of the Solomonic kingdom, Shishak invaded Jerusalem, spoiling the

royal palace and the house of the Lord. He was also interested in Syria as well as Palestine. The record of his victories is inscribed on a wall of the great southern court of the temple of Amun at Karnak in Egypt. More than 150 names of Palestinian towns are inscribed, though about a score or more are illegible. Some of the cities mentioned, the larger ones being in Israel, are Gath, Sharuhén, Arad, Gibeon, Beth-horon, Aijalon, Taanach, Megiddo, Bethshean, Shunem, Edrei, and Mahanaim. The inscription is important, not only because it corroborates the biblical account, but also because it names the cities involved and supplements the record of the Bible.

Israel in Egypt

If we could find the names of the patriarchs in the inscriptions and could identify them with certainty with the biblical characters, the case would be materially helped. The names Jacob-el and Joseph-el are found on a monument from the time of Thutmose III, but there is nothing to connect them with the patriarchs. The chances of finding the names of the patriarchs on the inscriptions would appear to be small, for the patriarchs lived nomadic lives, and had generally little touch with the political movements of their time (except for Joseph). However, there is another way whereby the biblical narrative may be tested. If the biblical accounts reflect accurately the conditions and customs of the day, they bear the strongest possible marks of authenticity and trustworthiness. Abraham's visit to Egypt in Genesis 12:10-20 can be tested in all its five prominent features against the Egyptian background of his day, and will be found corroborated in every detail. The account of Joseph's sojourn in Egypt is linked with the problem of the Hyksos. More recent studies reveal that there were an early period of Hyksos infiltration into Egypt and a later period. These coincide with the contact Abraham had with Egypt, and the later relationship Joseph sustained to it. Whether from the angle of distinctive pottery, the contribution to the field of metallurgy, type of town defense, or the use of horses and chariots, the rule of the Hyksos in Egypt is splendidly illuminated, and forms the backdrop of Israel's contact with that land. The Joseph story may be tested against its Egyptian background on more than a dozen particulars, down to the method of embalming,

and its reliability is attested at every turn. The Bible has received no greater attestation to its truthfulness from any land of antiquity, than it has enjoyed from the land of Egypt.

The Hittites

Before our twentieth century the biblical references to a Hittite people were looked at askance by the critics. In no uncertain terms it was claimed no such people as the Hittites ever existed. The biblical accounts dealing with this people were, then, nothing more than legendary. These attacks against the trustworthiness of the Scripture were completely met in 1906 when Hugo Winckler of Berlin discovered the royal library and record-office of the Hittites at their capital, Boghaz-keui in Asia Minor, about 150 miles south of the Black Sea and east of modern Ankara, Turkey. The result of the labors of a number of scholars on the Hittite inscriptions has been the emergence of a people and an empire scarcely less important than the Egyptians or Assyrians.

The Tell el-Amarna Tablets

The discovery of the clay Tell-el-Amarna Tablets in 1887 was by accident. A peasant woman was digging, to get dust to fertilize her garden, in the ruins of Tell el-Amarna in Upper Egypt, about 200 miles south of Cairo on the eastern bank of the Nile. Upon careful study by competent scholars these tablets proved to be part of the official archives of the kings Amenhotep III and Akhnaton. Amarna was the capital during the reign of the religious reformer, Akhnaton. The tablets are dated about 1400-1360 B.C., about the time of the entrance of Israel into Canaan from Egypt, according to the early dating of the Exodus, and the time immediately following it. They treat of the political affairs of the kings of Egypt and the rulers under the Egyptian kings in Babylonia, Syria, and Palestine. This was the period of great internationalism in the Near East.

From the standpoint of the Bible these letters are the most important find in Egypt. They are important politically, epigraphically, geographically, and historically. They reveal the extent and nature of diplomatic communication in that day. The political situation they portray in Palestine is one of an absence of concentrated power; rulers responsible to the Egyptian king governed

the different city-states. The letters give the Canaanite version of the invasion of the land under Joshua. The tablets throw light on how extensively and continuously the art of writing was known and practiced at that early date. The language of Canaan was almost identical with Hebrew. Help has been received for the spelling of proper names of Canaanitish origin, since the scribes of Egypt had to address their letters to the various Egyptian vice-roys in Palestine. The most remarkable feature about the language of the letters is that it is in the Babylonian cuneiform language, though it consists of Egyptian governors writing to Egyptian kings. Evidently, Babylonian was the international language of the day. Geographically, the letters identify a goodly number of places along the Syrian and Canaanitish coastland. As to the historical material, one estimate places it, as to amount, to about one-half of the Pentateuch.

It is sufficient to say that, while many more positive confirmations of the seemingly improbable statements of the sacred historians can be adduced, there have been no discoveries which contravene their statements. The cases already enumerated relate to such widely separated times and places, and furnish explanations so unexpected to difficulties that have been thought insuperable, that their testimony cannot be ignored or rejected. That this history should be confirmed in so many cases, and in such a remarkable manner by monuments uncovered millenniums after their erection, can be nothing else than providential. Surely, God has seen to it that the failing faith of these later days should not be left to grope in darkness. When the faith of many was waning, and many heralds of truth were tempted to speak with uncertain sound, the very stones have cried out with a voice that only the deaf could fail to hear. Both in the writing and in the preservation of the Bible we behold the handiwork of God.

(Note: A discussion of the important Dead Sea Scrolls has been purposely omitted, because it is even yet too early for a definitive evaluation of these significant finds.)

13

Science and Christian Faith

By Rev. Prof. James Orr, D.D.

United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland

Revised by Gerald B. Stanton, Th.D.

In many quarters the belief is industriously circulated that the advance of "science," meaning by this chiefly the physical sciences — astronomy, geology, biology, and the like — has proved damaging, if not destructive, to the claims of the Bible and the truth of Christianity. Science and Christianity are pitted against each other. Their interests are held to be antagonistic. Books have been written, such as Draper's *Conflict Between Religion and Science*, White's *Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, and Foster's *Finality of the Christian Religion*, to show that this warfare between science and religion has ever been going on, and can never in the nature of things cease till theology is destroyed and science holds sole sway in men's minds.

This was not the attitude of the older investigators of science. Most of these men were devout Christian men. Naville, in his book *Modern Physics*, has shown that the great discoverers in science in past times were nearly always devout men. This was true of Galileo, Kepler, Bacon, and Newton; it was true of men like Faraday, Brewster, Kelvin, and a host of others in more recent times. The late Professor Tait of Edinburgh, writing in *The International Review*, has said: "The assumed incompatibility of religion and science has been so often and confidently asserted in recent times that it has . . . come to be taken for granted by the writers of leading articles, and it is, of course, perpetually thrust before their too trusting readers. But the whole thing is a mistake, and a mistake so grave that no truly scientific man runs, in Britain, at least, the smallest risk of making it. With a few, and these very singular exceptions, the truly scientific men and true theo-

logians of the present day have not found themselves under the necessity of quarreling." The late Professor G. J. Romanes has, in his *Thoughts on Religion*, left the testimony that one thing which largely influenced him in his return to faith was the fact that in his own university of Cambridge nearly all the men of most eminent scientific attainments were avowed Christians. "The curious thing," he says, "is that all the most illustrious names were ranged on the side of orthodoxy. Sir W. Manson, Sir George Stokes, Professors Tait, Adams, Clerk Maxwell, and Bayley — not to mention a number of lesser lights, such as Route, Todhunter, Ferrers, etc. — were all avowed Christians" (p. 137). It may be held that things are now changed. To some extent this is perhaps true, but anyone who knows the opinions of our leading scientific men is aware that to accuse the majority of being men of unchristian or unbelieving sentiment is to utter a gross libel.

If by a conflict of science and religion is meant that grievous mistakes have often been made, and unhappy misunderstandings have arisen, on one side and the other, in the course of the progress of science — that new theories and discoveries, as in astronomy and geology, have been looked on with distrust by those who thought that the truth of the Bible was being affected by them — that in some cases the dominant church sought to stifle the advance of truth by persecution — this is not to be denied. It is an unhappy illustration of how the best of men can at times err in matters which they imperfectly understand, or where their prejudices and traditional ideas are affected. But it proves nothing against the value of the discoveries themselves, or the deeper insight into the ways of God of the men who made them, or of real contradiction between the new truth and the essential teaching of the Scriptures. On the contrary, as a minority generally perceived from the first, the supposed disharmony with the truths of the Bible was an unreal one, early giving way to better understanding on both sides, and finally opening up new vistas in the contemplation of the Creator's power, wisdom, and majesty. It is never to be forgotten, also, that the error was seldom all on one side; that science, too, has in numberless cases put forth its hasty and unwarrantable theories and has often had to retract even its truer speculations within limits which brought them into

more perfect harmony with revealed truth. If theology has resisted novelties of science, it has often had good reason for so doing.

It is well in any case that this alleged conflict of Christianity with science should be carefully probed, and that it should be seen where exactly the truth lies in regard to it.

I. SCIENCE AND LAW — MIRACLE

It is perhaps more in its *general outlook* on the world than in its specific results that science is alleged to be in conflict with the Bible and Christianity. The Bible is a record of divine revelation. Christianity is a supernatural system, and miracle, in the sense of a direct entrance of God in word and deed into human history for gracious ends, is of the essence of it. On the other hand, the advance of science has done much to deepen the impression of the universal reign of *natural law*. The effect has been to lead multitudes whose faith is not grounded in direct spiritual experience to look askance on the whole idea of the supernatural. God, it is assumed, has his own mode of working, and that is by means of secondary agencies operating in absolutely uniform ways; miracles, therefore, cannot be admitted. And, since miracles are found in Scripture — since the entire Book rests on the idea of a supernatural economy of grace — the whole must be dismissed as in conflict with the modern mind. Professor G. B. Foster goes so far as to declare that a man can hardly be intellectually honest who in these days professes to believe in the miracles of the Bible.

It would be overstating the case to speak of this present *repugnance to miracle*, and rejection of it in the Bible, as if it were really new. It is as old as rationalism itself. You find it in Spinoza, in Reimarus, in Strauss, and in numberless others. DeWette and Vatke, among earlier Old Testament critics, manifested it as strongly as their followers do now, and made it a pivot of their criticism. It governed the attacks on Christianity made in the age of the deists. David Hume wrote an essay against miracles which he thought had settled the question forever. But, seriously considered, can this attack on the idea of miracle, derived from our experience of the uniformity of nature's laws, be defended? Does it not in itself involve a huge assumption, and run counter to experience and common sense? The question is one well worth asking.

First, what is a miracle? Various definitions have been given, but it will be enough to speak of it here as *any effect in nature, or deviation from its ordinary course, due to the interposition of a supernatural cause*. It is no necessary part, it should be observed, of the biblical idea of miracle, that natural agencies should not be employed as far as they will go. If the drying of the Red Sea to let the Israelites pass over was due in part to a great wind that blew, this was none the less of God's ordering, and did not detract from the supernatural character of the event as a whole. It was still at God's command that the waters were parted and that a way was made at that particular time and place for the people to go through. These are what theologians call "providential" miracles, in which, so far as one can see, natural agencies under divine direction suffice to produce the result. There is, however, another and more conspicuous class, such as the instantaneous cleansing of the leper, or the raising of the dead, in which natural agencies are obviously altogether transcended. It is this class about which the chief discussion goes on. They are miracles in the stricter sense of a complete transcendence of nature's laws.

What, in the next place, is meant by the *uniformity of nature*? There are, of course, laws of nature — no one disputes that. It is quite a mistake to suppose that the Bible, though not written in the twentieth century, knows nothing of a regular order and system of nature. The world is God's world; it is established by his decree; he has given to every creature its nature, its bounds, its limits; all things continue according to his ordinances (Psa. 119: 91). However, law in the Bible is never viewed as having an independent existence. It is always regarded as an expression of the power or wisdom of God. It is this which gives the right point of view for considering the relation of law to miracle. What then do we mean by a "law" of nature? It is, as science will concede, only our registered observation of the order in which we find causes and events linked together in our experience. That they are so linked no one questions. If they were not, we should have no world in which we could live at all. Next, what do we mean by "uniformity" in this connection? We mean no more than this — that, given like causes, operating under like conditions,

like effects will follow. This is quite true, and it is doubtful if any will deny it.

But then, as J. S. Mill in his *Logic* pointed out long ago, a miracle in the strict sense is not a denial of either of these truths. A miracle is not the assertion that, the same causes operating, a different result is produced. It is, on the contrary, the assertion that a *new* cause has intervened, and this a cause which the theists cannot deny to be a *vera causa* — the will and power of God. Just as, when I lift my arm, or throw a stone high in the air, I do not abolish the law of gravitation but counteract or overrule its purely natural action by the introduction of a new transcending force; so, but in an infinitely higher way, is a miracle due to the interposition of the first cause of all, God himself. What the scientific man needs to prove to establish his objection to miracle is, not simply that natural causes operate uniformly, but that *no other than natural causes exist*; that natural causes exhaust all the causation in the universe. And that, we hold, he can never do.

It is obvious from what has now been said that the real question at issue in miracle is not natural law, but *theism*. It is to be recognized at once that miracle can profitably be discussed only on the basis of a theistic view of the universe. It is not disputed that there are views of the universe which exclude miracle. The atheist cannot admit miracle, for he has no God to work miracles. The pantheist cannot admit miracle, for to him God and nature are one. The deist cannot admit miracle, for he has separated God and the universe so far that he can never bring them together again. The question is not, "Is miracle possible on an atheistic, a materialistic, or a pantheistic, view of the world," but, "Is it possible on a theistic view — on the view of God as at once immanent in his world, and in infinite ways transcending it?" I say nothing of intellectual "honesty," but I do marvel at the *assurance* of any one who presumes to say that, for the highest and holiest ends in his personal relations with his creatures, God can work only within the limits which nature imposes; that he cannot act without and above nature's order if it pleases him to do so. Miracles stand or fall by their evidence, but the attempt to rule them out by any *a priori* dictum as to the uniformity of natural law must inevitably

fail. The same applies to the denial of providence or of answers to prayer on the ground of the uniformity of natural law. Here no breach of nature's order is affirmed, but only a governance or direction of nature of which man's own use of natural laws, without breach of them, for special ends, affords daily examples.

II. SCRIPTURE AND THE SPECIAL SCIENCES

Approaching more nearly the alleged conflict of the Bible or Christianity with the special sciences, a first question of importance is, "What is the *general relation* of the Bible to science? How does it claim to relate itself to the advances of natural knowledge?" Here, it is to be feared, mistakes are often made on both sides — on the side of science in affirming contrariety of the Bible with scientific results where none really exists; on the side of believers in demanding that the Bible be taken as a textbook of the newest scientific discoveries, and trying by forced methods to read these into them. The truth on this point lies really on the surface. The Bible clearly does not profess to anticipate the scientific discoveries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Its design is very different; namely, to reveal God and his will and his purposes of grace to men, and, as involved in this, his general relation to the creative world, its dependence in all its parts on him, and his orderly government of it in Providence for his wise and good ends. Natural things are taken as they are given, and spoken of in simple, popular language, as we ourselves every day speak of them. The world it describes is the world men know and live in, and it is described as it appears, not as, in its recondite researches, science reveals its inner constitution to us. Wise expositors of the Scriptures, older and younger, have always recognized this, and have not attempted to force its language further. To take only one example, John Calvin, who wrote before the Copernican system of astronomy had obtained common acceptance, in his commentary on the first chapter of Genesis penned these wise words: "He who would learn astronomy and other recondite arts," he said, "let him go elsewhere. Moses wrote in a popular style things which, without instruction, all ordinary persons indued with common sense are able to understand. . . . He does not call us up to heaven, he only proposes things that lie open before our eyes." To this hour, with all the light of modern science around us, we

speak of sun, moon and stars "rising" and "setting," and nobody misunderstands or affirms contradiction with science. There is no doubt another side to this, for it is just as true that in depicting natural things, the Bible, through the Spirit of revelation that animates it, seizes things in such a light—still with reference to its own purposes—that the mind is prevented from being led astray from the great truths intended to be conveyed.

It will serve to illustrate these positions as to the relation of the Bible to science if we look at them briefly in their application to the two sciences of *astronomy* and *geology*, in regard to which conflict has often been alleged.

1. The change from the *Ptolemaic* to the *Copernican* system of astronomy — from the view which regarded the earth as the center of the universe to the modern and undoubtedly true view of the earth moving round the sun, itself, with its planets, but one of innumerable orbs in the starry heavens — of necessity created great searchings of heart among those who thought that the language of the Bible committed them to the older system. For a time there was strong opposition on the part of many theologians, as well as of students of science, to the new discoveries of the telescope. Galileo was imprisoned by the church. But truth prevailed, and it was soon perceived that the Bible, using the language of appearances, was no more committed to the literal moving of the sun around the earth than are our modern almanacs, which employ the same forms of speech. One would have to travel far in these days to find a Christian who feels his faith in the least affected by the discovery of the true doctrine of the solar system. He rejoices that he understands nature better, and reads his Bible without the slightest sense of contradiction. Yet Strauss was confident that the Copernican system had given its death-blow to Christianity; as Voltaire before him had affirmed that Christianity would be overthrown by the discovery of the law of gravitation and would not survive a century. Newton, the humble-minded Christian discoverer of the law of gravitation, had no such fear, and time has shown that it was he, not Voltaire, who was right. These are specimens of the "conflicts" of Christianity with science.

The so-called "astronomical objection" to Christianity more specially takes the form of enlarging on the *illimitableness* of the universe disclosed by science in contrast with the *peculiar* interest of God in man displayed in the Christian Gospel. "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" (Psa. 8:4). Is it credible that this small speck in an infinity of worlds should be singled out as the scene of so tremendous an exhibition of God's love and grace as is implied in the incarnation of the Son of God, the sacrifice of the cross, the redemption of man? The day is well-nigh past when even this objection is felt to carry much weight. Apart from the strange fact that up to this hour no evidence seems to exist of other worlds inhabited by rational intelligences like man — no planets, no known systems — thoughtful people have come to realize that quantitative bigness is no measure of God's love and care; that the value of a soul is not to be estimated in terms of stars and planets; that sin is not less awful a fact even if it were proved that this is the only spot in the universe in which it has emerged. It is of the essence of God's infinity that he cares for the little as well as for the great; not a blade of grass could wave, or the insect of a day live its brief life upon the wing, if God were not actually present, and minutely careful of it. Man's position in the universe remains, by consent, or rather by proof, of science, an altogether peculiar one. Link between the material and the spiritual, he is the one being that seems fitted, as Scripture affirms he is, to be the bond of unity in the creation (Heb. 2:6-9). This is the hope held out to us in Christ (Eph. 1:10).

One should reflect also that, while the expanse of the *physical* universe is a modern thought, there has never been a time in the Christian Church when God — himself infinite — was not conceived of as adored and served by *countless hosts* of ministering spirits. Man was never thought of as the only intelligence in creation. The mystery of the divine love to our world was in reality as great before as after the stellar expanses were discovered. The sense of "conflict," therefore, though not the sense of wonder, awakened by the "exceeding riches" of God's grace to man in Christ Jesus, vanishes with increasing realization of the depths and heights of God's love "which passeth knowledge" (Eph. 3:19). Astronomy's splendid demonstration of the majesty of God's

wisdom and power is undiminished by any feeling of disharmony with the Gospel.

2. As it is with astronomy, so it has been with the revelations of geology of the age and gradual formation of the earth. Here also doubt and suspicion were — naturally enough in the circumstances — at first awakened. The gentle Cowper could write in his "Task" of those:

. . . *who drill and bore*
The solid earth and from the strata there
Extract a register, by which we learn
That He who made it, and revealed its date
To Moses, was mistaken in its age.

If the intention of the first chapter of Genesis was really to give us the "date" of the creation of the earth and heavens, the objection would be unanswerable. But things, as in the case of astronomy, are now better understood, and few are disquieted in reading their Bibles because it is made certain that the world is immensely older than the 6,000 years which the older chronology gave it. Geology is felt only to have expanded our ideas of the vastness and marvel of the Creator's operations through the aeons of time during which the world, with its teeming populations of fishes, birds, reptiles, mammals, was preparing for man's abode — when the mountains were being upheaved, the valleys being scooped out, and veins of precious metals being inlaid into the crust of the earth.

Does science, then, really contradict Genesis 1? Not surely if what has been above said of the essentially popular character of the allusions to natural things in the Bible be remembered. Here certainly is no detailed description of the process of the formation of the earth in terms anticipative of modern science — terms which would have been unintelligible to the original readers — but a sublime picture, true to the order of nature, as it is to the broad facts even of geological succession. If it tells how God called heaven and earth into being, separated light from darkness, sea from land, clothed the world with vegetation, gave sun and moon their appointed rule of day and night, made fowl to fly, and sea-monsters to plow the deep, created the cattle and beasts of the field,

and finally made man, male and female, in his own image, and established him as ruler over all God's creation, this orderly succession of created forms, man crowning the whole, these deep ideas of the narrative, setting the world at the very beginning in its right relation to God and laying the foundations of an enduring philosophy of religion, are truths which science does nothing to subvert, but in myriad ways confirms. The "six days" may remain as a difficulty to some, but, if this is more than a symbolic setting of the picture — a great divine "week" of work — one may well ask, as was done by Augustine long before geology was thought of, what kind of "days" these were which rolled their course before the sun, with its twenty-four hours of diurnal measurement, was appointed to that end? There is no violence done to the narrative in substituting in thought "aeonic" days — vast cosmic periods — for "days" on our narrower, sun-measured scale. Then the last trace of apparent "conflict" disappears.

The conclusion of the matter is, that, up to the present hour, science and the biblical views of God, man, and the world do not stand in any real relation of conflict. Each book of God's writing reflects light upon the pages of the other, but neither contradicts the other's essential testimony. Science itself seems now disposed to take a less materialistic view of the origin and nature of things than it did a decade or two ago, and to interpret the creation more in the light of the spiritual. The experience of the Christian believer, with the work of missions in heathen lands, furnishes a testimony that cannot be disregarded to the reality of this spiritual world, and of the regenerating, transforming forces proceeding from it. To God be all the glory!

14

The Inspiration of the Bible — Definition, Extent and Proof

By Rev. James M. Gray, D.D.

Dean of Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Ill.

Revised and edited by Gerald B. Stanton, Th.D.

In this paper the authenticity and credibility of the Bible are assumed, by which is meant: (1) that its books were written by the authors to whom they are ascribed, and that their contents are in all material points as when they came from their hands; and (2) that those contents are worthy of entire acceptance as to their statements of fact. Were there need to prove these assumptions, the evidence is abundant, and abler pens have dealt with it.

Let it not be supposed, however, that because these things are assumed their relative importance is undervalued. On the contrary, they underlie inspiration, and, as President Patton says, come in on the ground floor. They have to do with the historicity of the Bible, which for us just now is the basis of its authority. Nothing can be settled until this is settled, but admitting its settlement which, all things concerned, we now may be permitted to do, what can be of deeper interest than the question as to how far that authority extends?

For a long while the enemy's attack has directed our energies to another part of the field, but victory there will drive us back here again. The other questions are outside of the Bible itself, this is inside. They lead men away from the contents of the book to consider how they came; this brings us back to consider what they are. Happy the day when the inquiry returns here, and happy the generation which has not forgotten how to meet it.

I. DEFINITION OF INSPIRATION

1. *Inspiration is not revelation.* As Dr. Charles Hodge expressed it, revelation is the act of communicating divine knowledge

to the mind, but inspiration is the act of the same Spirit controlling those who make that knowledge known to others. Sometimes both of these experiences met in the same person; indeed Moses himself is an illustration of it, having received a revelation at another time and also the inspiration to make it known, but it is of importance to distinguish between the two.

2. *Inspiration is not illumination.* Every regenerated Christian is illuminated in the simple fact that he is indwelt by the Holy Spirit, but every such an one is not also inspired, but only the writers of the Old and New Testaments. Spiritual illumination is subject to degrees, some Christians possessing more of it than others; but inspiration is not subject to degrees, being in every case the breath of God, expressing itself through a human personality.

3. *Inspiration is not human genius.* The latter is simply a natural qualification, however exalted it may be in some cases, but inspiration in the sense now spoken of is supernatural throughout. It is an endowment coming upon the writers of the Old and New Testaments directing and enabling them to write those books, and on no other men, and at no other time, and for no other purpose. No human genius of whom we ever heard introduced his writings with the formula, "Thus saith the Lord," or words to that effect, and yet such is the common utterance of the Bible authors. No human genius ever yet agreed with any other human genius as to the things it most concerns men to know, and, therefore, however exalted his equipment, it differs not merely in degree but in kind from the inspiration of the Scriptures.

4. When we speak of the Holy Spirit coming upon the men in order to the composition of the books, it should be further understood that the object is not the inspiration of the men but the books — not the writers but the writings. It terminates upon the record, in other words, and not upon the human instrument who made it.

To illustrate: Moses, David, Paul, John, were not always and everywhere inspired, for then always and everywhere they would have been infallible and inerrant, which was not the case. They sometimes made mistakes in thought and erred in conduct. But

however fallible and errant they may have been as men compassed with infirmity like ourselves, such fallibility or errancy was never under any circumstances communicated to their sacred writings.

This disposes of a large class of objections sometimes brought against the doctrine of inspiration—those, for example, associated with the question as to whether the Bible is the Word of God or only contains that Word. If by the former be meant that God spake every word in the Bible, and hence that every word is true, the answer must be *no*; but if it be meant that God caused every word in the Bible, true or false, to be recorded, the answer should be *yes*. There are words of Satan in the Bible, words of false prophets, words of the enemies of Christ, and yet they are God's words, not in the sense that he uttered them, but that he caused them to be recorded, infallibly and inerrantly recorded, for our profit. In this sense, the Bible does not merely contain the Word of God, it is the Word of God.

5. Let it be stated further in this definitional connection, that the record for whose inspiration we contend is the original record—the autographs or parchments of Moses, David, Daniel, Matthew, Paul or Peter, as the case may be, and not any particular translation or translations of them whatever. There is no translation absolutely without error, nor could there be, considering the infirmities of human copyists, unless God were pleased to perform a perpetual miracle to secure it.

But does this make nugatory our contention? Some would say it does, and they would argue speciously that to insist on the inerrancy of a parchment no living being has ever seen is an academic question merely, and without value. But do they not fail to see that the character and perfection of the Godhead are involved in that inerrancy?

Some years ago a "liberal" theologian, deprecating this discussion as not worthwhile, remarked that it was a matter of small consequence whether a pair of trousers were originally perfect if they were now rent. To which the valiant and witty David James Burrell replied, that it might be a matter of small consequence to the wearer of the trousers, but the tailor who made them would prefer to have it understood that they did not leave his shop that

way. And then he added, that if the Most High must train among knights of the shears he might at least be regarded as the best of the guild, and One who drops no stiches and sends out no imperfect work.

But if this question be so purely speculative and valueless, what becomes of the science of biblical criticism by which properly we set such store today? Do builders drive piles into soft earth if they never expect to touch bottom? Do scholars dispute about the Scripture text and minutely examine the history and meaning of single words, "the delicate coloring of mood, tense and accent," if at the end there is no approximation to an absolute? As Dr. George H. Bishop says, does not our concordance, every time we take it up, speak loudly to us of a once inerrant parchment? Why do we not possess concordances for the very words of other books?

Nor is that original parchment so remote a thing as some suppose. Do not the number and variety of manuscripts and versions extant render it comparatively easy to arrive at a knowledge of its text, and does not competent scholarship today affirm that as to the New Testament at least, we have in 999 cases out of every thousand the very word of that original text? Let candid consideration be given to these things, and it will be seen that we are not pursuing a phantom in contending for an inspired autograph of the Bible.

II. EXTENT OF INSPIRATION

1. The inspiration of Scripture includes the whole and every part of it. There are some who deny this and limit it to only the prophetic portions, the words of Jesus Christ, and, say, the profounder spiritual teachings of the epistles. The historical books in their judgment, and as an example, do not require inspiration because their data were obtainable from natural sources.

The Bible itself, however, knows of no limitations, as we shall see: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." The historical data, most of it at least, might have been obtained from natural sources, but what about the supernatural guidance required in their selection and narration? Compare, for example, the records of creation, the fall, the deluge, etc., found in Genesis with those already discovered by excavations in Bible lands. Do not the results of the pick-axe and the spade point to the same original

as the Bible, and yet do not their childishness and grotesqueness often bear evidence of the human and sinful mould through which they ran? Do they not show the need of some power other than man himself to lead him out of the labyrinth or error into the open ground of truth?

Furthermore, are not the historical books in some respects the most important in the Bible? Are they not the bases of its doctrine? Does not the doctrine of sin need for its starting point the record of the fall? Could we so satisfactorily understand justification did we not have the story of God's dealings with Abraham? And what of the priesthood of Christ? Dismiss Leviticus and what can be made of Hebrews? Is not the Acts of the Apostles historical, but can we afford to lose its inspiration?

Indeed, the historical books have the strongest testimony borne to their importance in other parts of the Bible. This will appear more particularly as we proceed, but take, in passing, Christ's use of Deuteronomy in his conflict with the tempter. Thrice does he overcome him by a citation from that historical book without note or comment. Is it not difficult to believe that neither he nor Satan considered it inspired?

Thus without going further, we may say that it is impossible to secure the *religious* infallibility of the Bible — which is all the objector regards as necessary — if we exclude Bible history from the sphere of its inspiration. But if we include Bible history at all, we must include the whole of it, for who is competent to separate its parts?

2. The inspiration includes not only all the books of the Bible in general but in detail, the form as well as the substance, the word as well as the thought. This is sometimes called the verbal theory of inspiration and is vehemently spoken against in some quarters. It is too mechanical, it degrades the writers to the level of machines, it has a tendency to make skeptics, and all that.

This last remark, however, is not so alarming as it sounds. The doctrine of the eternal retribution of the wicked is said to make skeptics, and also that of a vicarious atonement, not to mention other revelations of Holy Writ. The natural mind takes to none of these things. But if we are not prepared to yield the point in

one case for such a reason, why should we be asked to do it in another?

But we are insisting upon no theory that altogether excludes the human element in the transmission of the Sacred Word. As Dr. Henry B. Smith says, "God speaks through the personality as well as the lips of his messengers," and we may pour into that word "personality" everything that goes to make it — the age in which the person lived, his environment, his degree of culture, his temperament and all the rest. It is limiting the Holy One of Israel to say that he is unable to do this without turning a human being into an automaton. Has he who created man as a free agent left himself no opportunity to mould his thoughts into forms of speech inerrantly expressive of his will, without destroying that which he has made?

Indeed, wherein resides man's free agency, in his mind or in his mouth? Shall we say he is free while God controls his thought, but that he becomes a mere machine when that control extends to the expression of his thought?

In the last analysis, it is the Bible itself which must settle the question of its inspiration and the extent of it, and to this we come in the consideration of the proof, but we may be allowed a final question. Can even God himself give a thought to man without the words that clothe it? Are not the two inseparable, as much so "as a sum and its figures, or a tune and its notes?" Has any case been known in human history where a healthy mind has been able to create ideas without expressing them to its own perception? In other words, as Dr. A. J. Gordon once observed: "To deny that the Holy Spirit speaks in scripture is an intelligible proposition, but to admit that he speaks, it is impossible to know what he says except as we have his words."

III. PROOF OF INSPIRATION

1. *The inspiration of the Bible is proven by the philosophy, or what may be called the nature of the case.*

The proposition may be stated thus: The Bible is the history of the redemption of the race, or from the side of the individual, a supernatural revelation of the will of God to men for their salvation. But it was given to certain men of one age to be conveyed

in writing to other men in different ages. Now all men experience difficulty in giving faithful reflections of their thoughts to others because of sin, ignorance, defective memory and the inaccuracy always incident to the use of language.

Therefore, it may be easily deduced that if the revelation is to be communicated precisely as originally received, the same supernatural power is required in the one case as in the other. This has been sufficiently elaborated in the foregoing and need not be dwelt upon again.

2. It may be proven by the history and character of the Bible, i.e., by all that has been assumed as to its authenticity and credibility. All that goes to prove these things goes to prove its inspiration.

To borrow in part, the language of the Westminster Confession, "the heavenliness of its matter, the efficacy of its doctrine, the unity of its various parts, the majesty of its style and the scope and completeness of its design," all indicate the divinity of its origin.

The more we think upon it the more we must be convinced that men unaided by the Spirit of God could neither have conceived, nor put together, nor preserved in its integrity that precious deposit known as the Sacred Oracles.

3. The strongest proof is the declarations of the Bible itself and the inferences to be drawn from them. Nor is this reasoning in a circle as some might think. In the case of a man as to whose veracity there is no doubt, no hesitancy is felt in accepting what he says about himself; and since the Bible is demonstrated to be true in its statements of fact by unassailable evidence, may we not accept its witness in its own behalf?

Take the argument from Jesus Christ as an illustration. He was content to be tested by the prophecies of himself that went before, and the result was the definite establishment of his claims to be the Messiah. That complex system of prophecies, rendering collusion or counterfeit impossible, is the incontestable proof that he was what he claimed to be. yes!

It is so with the Bible. The character of its contents, the unity of its parts, the fulfillment of its prophecies, the miracles wrought in its attestation, the effects it has accomplished in the lives of

nations and of men, all these go to show that it is divine, and if so, that it may be believed in what it says about itself.

A. Argument for the Old Testament.

To begin with the Old Testament, (a) consider how the writers speak of the origin of their messages. Dr. James H. Brookes is authority for saying that the phrase, "Thus saith the Lord" or its equivalent is used by them 2,000 times. Suppose we eliminate this phrase and its necessary context from the Old Testament in every instance, one wonders how much of the Old Testament would remain.

(b) Consider how the utterances of the Old Testament writers are introduced into the New. Take Matthew 1:22 as an illustration, "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet." It was not the prophet who spake, but the Lord who spake through the prophet.

(c) Consider how Christ and his apostles regard the Old Testament. He came "not to destroy but to fulfill the law and the prophets" (Matt. 5:17). "The Scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35). He sometimes used single words as the bases of important doctrines, twice in Matthew 22, at verses 31, 32 and 42-45. The apostles do the same (see Gal. 3:16; Heb. 2:8, 11 and 12:26, 27).

(d) Consider what the apostles directly teach upon the subject. Peter tells us that "No prophecy ever came by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (II Pet. 1:21, ASV). "Prophecy" here applies to the word written as is indicated in the preceding verse, and means not merely the foretelling of events, but the utterances of any word of God without reference as to time past, present or to come. As a matter of fact, what Peter declares is that the will of man had nothing to do with any part of the Old Testament, but that the whole of it, from Genesis to Malachi, was inspired by God.

Of course, Paul says the same, in language even plainer, in II Timothy 3:16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable." The phrase "inspiration of God" means literally God-breathed. The whole of the Old Testament is God-breathed, for it is to that part of the Bible the language particu-

larly refers, since the New Testament as such was not then generally known.

As this verse is given somewhat differently in the Revised Version we dwell upon it a moment longer. It there reads, "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable," and the caviller is disposed to say that therefore some scripture may be inspired and some may not be, and that the profitableness extends only to the former and not the latter.

But aside from the fact that Paul would hardly be guilty of such a weak truism as that, it may be stated in reply first, that the King James rendering of the passage is not only the more consistent Scripture, but the more consistent Greek. Several of the best Greek scholars of the period affirm this, including some of the revisers themselves who did not vote for the change. And secondly, even the revisers place it in the margin as of practically equal authority with their preferred translation, and to be chosen by the reader if desired. There are not a few devout Christians, however, who would be willing to retain the rendering of the Revised Version as being stronger than the King James, and who would interpolate a word in applying it to make it mean, "Every scripture (because) inspired of God is also profitable." We believe that both Gaussen and Wordsworth take this view, two as staunch defenders of plenary inspiration as could be named.

B. Argument for the New Testament

We are sometimes reminded that, however strong and convincing the argument for the inspiration of the Old Testament, that for the New Testament is only indirect. "Not one of the evangelists tells us that he is inspired," says a certain theological professor, "and not one writer of an epistle, except Paul."

While we are prepared to dispute this statement, let us first reflect that the inspiration of the Old Testament being assured as it is, why should similar evidence be required for the New? Whoever is competent to speak as a Bible authority knows that the *unity* of the Old and New Testaments is the strongest demonstration of their common source. They are seen to be not two books, but only two parts of one book.

It is somewhat as follows that Dr. Gaussen in his exhaustive *Theopneustia* (now published by Moody Press under the title, *The*

Inspiration of the Holy Scripture) gives the argument for the inspiration of the New Testament.

(a) The New Testament is the later, and for that reason the more important revelation of the two, and hence if the former were inspired, it certainly must be true of the latter. The opening verses of the first and second chapters of Hebrews plainly suggest this: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard."

This inference is rendered still more conclusive by the circumstance that the New Testament sometimes explains, sometimes proves, and sometimes even repeals ordinances of the Old Testament. See Matthew 1:22, 23 for an illustration of the first, Acts 13:19 to 39 for the second, and Galatians 5:6 for the third. Assuredly, these things would not be true if the New Testament were not of equal, and in a certain sense, even greater authority than the Old.

(b) The writers of the New Testament were of an equal or higher rank than those of the Old. That they were prophets is evident from such allusions as Romans 16:25-27, and Ephesians 3:4, 5. But that they were more than prophets is indicated in the fact that wherever in the New Testament prophets and apostles are both mentioned, the last-named is always mentioned first (see I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 2:20; 4:11). It is also true that the writers of the New Testament had a higher mission than those of the Old, since they were sent forth by Christ, as he had been sent forth by the Father (John 20:21). They were to go, not to a single nation only (as Israel), but into all the world (Matt. 28:19). They received the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 16:19), and they are to be pre-eminently rewarded in the regeneration (Matt. 19:28). Such considerations and comparisons as these are not to be overlooked in estimating the authority by which they wrote.

(c) The writers of the New Testament were especially qualified for their work, as we see in Matthew 10:19, 20; Mark 13:11; Luke 12:2; John 14:26 and 16:13, 14. It may be noticed that in some instances, inspiration of the most absolute character was promised as to what they should *speak* — the inference being

warranted that none the less would they be guided in what they wrote. Their spoken words were limited and temporary in their sphere, but their written utterances covered the whole range of revelation and were to last forever. If in the one case they were inspired, how much more in the other?

(d) The writers of the New Testament directly claim divine inspiration. See Acts 15:23-29, where, especially at verse 28, James is recorded as saying, "for it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." Here it is affirmed very clearly that the Holy Ghost is the real writer of the letter in question and simply uses the human instruments for his purpose. Add to this I Corinthians 2:13, where Paul says "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual," or as the margin of the Revised Version puts it, "imparting spiritual things to spiritual men." In I Thessalonians 2:13 the same writer says: "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of man, but as it is in truth the word of God." In II Peter 3:2 the apostle places his own words on a level with those of the prophets of the Old Testament, and in verses 15 and 16 of the same chapter he does the same with the writings of Paul, classifying them "with the other scriptures." Finally, in Revelation 2:7, although it is the Apostle John who is writing, he is authorized to exclaim: "He that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches," and so on throughout the epistles to the seven churches.

C. *Argument for the Words*

The evidence that the inspiration includes the form as well as the substance of the Holy Scriptures, the word as well as the thought, may be gathered in this way.

1. *There were certainly some occasions when the words were given to the human agents.* Take the instance of Balaam (Num. 22:38; 23:12, 16). It is clear that this self-seeking prophet *thought*, i.e., desired to speak differently from what he did, but was obliged to speak the word that God put in his mouth. There are two

incontrovertible witnesses to this, one being Balaam himself and the other God.

Take Saul (I Sam. 10:10), or at a later time, his messengers (19:20-24). No one will claim that there was not an inspiration of the words here. And Caiaphas also (John 11:49-52), of whom it is expressly said that when he prophesied that one man should die for the people, "this spake he not of himself." Who believes that Caiaphas meant or really knew the significance of what he said?

How entirely this harmonizes with Christ's promise to his disciples in Matthew 10:19, 20 and elsewhere. "When they deliver you up take no thought [be not anxious] how or what ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." Mark is even more emphatic: "Neither do ye *premeditate*, but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye, for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."

Take the circumstance of the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:4-11), when the disciples "began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." Parthians, Medes, Elamites, the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, the strangers of Rome, Cretes and Arabians all testified, "we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God!" Did not this inspiration include the words? Did it not indeed *exclude* the thought? What clearer example could be desired?

Now, consider the utterance of I Peter 1:10, 11, where he speaks of them who prophesied of the grace that should come, as "searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when he testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, to whom it was revealed," etc.

"Should we see a student who, having taken down the lecture of a profound philosopher, was now studying diligently to comprehend the sense of the discourse which he had written, we should understand simply that he was a pupil and not a master; that he had nothing to do with originating either the thoughts or the words of the lecture, but was rather a disciple whose province it was to

understand what he had transcribed, and so be able to communicate it to others.

"And who can deny that this is the exact picture of what we have in this passage from Peter? Here were inspired writers studying the meaning of what they themselves had written. With all possible allowance for the human peculiarities of the writers, they must have been reporters of what they heard, rather than formulators of that which they had been made to understand" (A. J. Gordon, *The Ministry of the Spirit*, pp. 173, 174).

2. The Bible plainly teaches that inspiration extends to its words. We spoke of Balaam as uttering that which God put in his mouth, but the same expression is used by God himself with reference to his prophets. When Moses would excuse himself from service because he was not eloquent, he who made man's mouth said, "Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say" (Ex. 4:10-12). And Dr. James H. Brookes' comment is very pertinent: "God did not say I will be with thy mind, and teach thee what thou shalt think; but I will be with thy mouth and teach thee what thou shalt say." This explains why, forty years afterwards, Moses said to Israel, 'Ye shall not add unto the word I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it' (Deut. 4:2)." Seven times Moses tells us that the tables of stone containing the commandments were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables (Ex. 31:16).

Passing from the Pentateuch to the poetical books we find David saying, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue" (II Sam. 23:1, 2). He, too, does not say, God thought by me, but spake by me.

Coming to the prophets, Jeremiah confesses that, like Moses, he recoiled from the mission on which he was sent and for the same reason. He was a child and could not speak. "Then the Lord put forth his hand and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my word in thy mouth" (Jer. 1:6-9).

All of which substantiates the declaration of Peter quoted earlier, that "no prophecy ever came by the will of man, but man spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." Surely, if the will of

man had *nothing* to do with the prophecy, he could not have been at liberty in the selection of the words.

So much for the Old Testament. When we reach the New, we have the same unerring and verbal accuracy guaranteed to the apostles by the Son of God, as we have seen. And we have the apostles making claim of it, as when Paul in I Corinthians 2:12, 13 distinguishes between the "things" or the thoughts which God gave him and the words in which he expressed them, and insisting on the divinity of both; "Which things also we speak," he says, "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." In Galatians 3:16, following the example of his divine Master, he employs not merely a single word, but a single letter of a word as the basis of an argument for a great doctrine. The blessing of justification which Abraham received has become that of the believer in Jesus Christ. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy *seed*, which is Christ."

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews bases a similar argument on the word "all" in chapter 1:8, on the word "one" in 1:11, and on the phrase "yet once more" in 12:26, 27.

3. The most unique argument for the inspiration of the words of Scripture is the relation which Jesus Christ bears to them. In the first place, he himself was inspired as to his words. In the earliest reference to his prophetic office (Deut. 18:18), Jehovah says, "I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak . . . all that I shall command him." This was a limitation on his utterance which Jesus everywhere recognizes. "As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things"; "the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak"; "whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak"; "I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me"; "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life" (John 6:63; 8:26, 28, 40; 12:49, 50).

The thought is still more impressive as we read of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the God-man. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor"; "He through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles"; "the revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him";

"these things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand"; "He that hath an ear let him hear what the *Spirit* saith unto the churches" (Luke 4:18; Acts 1:2; Rev. 1:1; 2:1, 11). If the incarnate Word needed the unction of the Holy Ghost to give to men the revelation he received from the Father in whose bosom he dwells, and if the agency of the same Spirit extended to the words he spake in preaching the gospel to the meek, how much more must these things be so in the case of ordinary men when engaged in the same service? With what show of reason can one contend that any Old or New Testament writer stood, so far as his words were concerned, in need of no such agency" (*The New Apologetic*, pp. 67, 68).

In the second place, Christ used the Scriptures as though they were inspired as to their words. In Matthew 22:31-32 he substantiates the doctrine of the resurrection against the skepticism of the Sadducees by emphasizing the present tense of the verb "to be," *i.e.*, the word "am" in the language of Jehovah to Moses at the burning bush. In verses 42-45 of the same chapter he does the same for his own deity by alluding to the second use of the word "Lord" in Psalm 110. "The LORD said unto my Lord . . . If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" In John 10:34-36, he vindicates himself from the charge of blasphemy by saying, "Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"

We see him in Matthew 4 overcoming the tempter in the wilderness by three quotations from Deuteronomy without note or comment except, "*It is written.*" Referring to this Adolphe Monod says, "I know of nothing in the whole history of humanity, nor even in the field of divine revelation, that proves more clearly than this the inspiration of the Scriptures. What! Jesus Christ, the Lord of heaven and earth, calling to his aid in that solemn moment Moses his servant? He who speaks from heaven fortifying himself against the temptations of hell by the word of him who spake from earth? How can we explain that spiritual mystery, that wonderful reversing of the order of things, if for Jesus the words of Moses

were not the words of God rather than those of men? How shall we explain it if Jesus were not fully aware that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost? . . . Let that which was sufficient for him suffice for you. Fear not that the rock which sustained the Lord in the hour of his temptation and distress will give way because you lean too heavily upon it."

In the third place, Christ teaches that the Scriptures are inspired as to their words. In the Sermon on the Mount he said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

Here is testimony confirmed by an oath, for "verily" on the lips of the Son of Man carries such force. He affirms the indestructibility of the law, not its substance merely but its form, not the thought but the word.

"One jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." The "jot" means the *yod*, the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet, while the "tittle" means the *horn*, a short projection in certain letters extending the base line beyond the upright one which rests upon it. A reader unaccustomed to the Hebrew needs a strong eye to see the tittle, but Christ guarantees that as a part of the sacred text, neither the tittle nor the yod shall perish.

IV. DIFFICULTIES AND OBJECTIONS

That there are difficulties in the way of accepting a view of inspiration like this goes without saying. But to the finite mind there must always be difficulties connected with a revelation from the Infinite, and it cannot be otherwise. Men of faith, and it is such we are addressing and not men of the world, do not wait to understand or resolve all the difficulties associated with other mysteries of the Bible before accepting them as divine, and why should they do so in this case?

Moreover, Archbishop Whately's dictum is generally accepted, that we are not obliged to clear away every difficulty about a doctrine in order to believe it, always provided that the facts on which it rests are true. Particularly is this the case where the

rejection of such a doctrine involves greater difficulties than its belief, as it does here.

For if this view of inspiration be rejected, what have its opponents to give in its place? Do they realize that any objections to it are slight in comparison with those to any other view that can be named? And do they realize that this is true, because this view has the immeasurable advantage of agreeing with the plain declarations of Scripture on the subject? In other words, as Dr. Burrell says, those who assert the inerrancy of the scripture autographs do so on the authority of God himself, and to deny it is of a piece with the denial that they teach the forgiveness of sins or the resurrection from the dead. No amount of exegetical turning and twisting can explain away the assertions already quoted in these pages, to say nothing of the constant undertone of evidence we find in the Bible everywhere to their truth. But now let us consider some of the same difficulties.

1. There are the so-called discrepancies or contradictions between certain statements of the Bible and the facts of history or natural science. The best way to meet these is to treat them separately as they are presented, but when you ask for them you are not infrequently met with silence. They are hard to produce, and when produced, who is able to say that they belong to the original parchments? As we are not contending for an inerrant translation, does not the burden of proof rest with the objector?

But some of these "discrepancies" are easily explained. They do not exist between statements of the Bible and facts of science, but between erroneous interpretations of the Bible and immature conclusions of science. The old story of Galileo is in point, who did not contradict the Bible in affirming that the earth moved round the sun, but only the false theological assumption about it. In this way advancing light has removed many of these discrepancies, and it is fair to presume that further light would remove all.

2. *There are the differences in the narratives themselves.* In the first place, the New Testament writers sometimes change important words in quoting from the Old Testament, which it is assumed could not be the case if in both instances the writers were inspired. But it is forgotten that in the Scriptures we are dealing not so much with different human authors as with one Divine

Author. It is a principle in ordinary literature that an author may quote himself as he pleases, and give a different turn to an expression here and there as a changed condition of affairs renders it necessary or desirable. Shall we deny this privilege to the Holy Spirit? May we not find, indeed, that some of these supposed misquotations show such progress of truth, such evident application of the teaching of an earlier dispensation to the circumstances of a later one, as to afford a confirmation of their divine origin rather than an argument against it? We offer as illustrations of this principle Isaiah 59:20 quoted in Romans 11:26, and Amos 9:11 quoted in Acts 15:16.

Another class of differences, however, is where the *same event* is sometimes given differently by different writers. Take that most frequently used by the objectors, the inscription on the cross, recorded by all the evangelists and yet differently by each. How can such records be inspired, it is asked.

It is to be remembered in reply, that the inscription was written in three languages calling for a different arrangement of the words in each case, and that one evangelist may have translated the Hebrew, and another the Latin, while a third recorded the Greek. It is not said that any one gave the *full* inscription, nor can we affirm that there was any obligation upon them to do so. Moreover, no one contradicts any other, and no one says what is untrue.

Recalling what was said about our having to deal not with different human authors but with one Divine Author, may not the Holy Spirit here have chosen to emphasize some one particular fact, or phase of a fact of the inscription for a specific and important end? Examine the records to determine what this fact may have been. Observe that whatever else is omitted, all the narratives record the momentous circumstances that the Sufferer on the cross was THE KING OF THE JEWS.

Could there have been a cause for this? What was the charge preferred against Jesus by his accusers? Was he not rejected and crucified, because he said he was the King of the Jews? Was not this the central idea Pilate was providentially guided to express in the inscription? And if so, was it not that to which the evan-

gospels should bear witness? And should not that witness have been borne in a way to dispel the thought of collusion in the premises? And did not this involve a variety of narrative which should at the same time be in harmony with truth and fact? And do we not have this very thing in the four gospels?

These accounts supplement, but do not contradict each other. We place them before the eye in the order in which they are recorded.

This is Jesus	THE KING OF THE JEWS
	THE KING OF THE JEWS
This is	THE KING OF THE JEWS
Jesus of Nazareth	THE KING OF THE JEWS

The entire inscription evidently was "This is Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews," but we submit that the foregoing presents a reasonable argument for the differences in the records.

3. *There is the variety in style.* Some think that if all the writers were alike inspired and the inspiration extended to their words, they must all possess the same style — as if the Holy Spirit had but one style!

Literary style is a method of selecting words and putting sentences together which stamps an author's work with the influence of his habits, his condition in society, his education, his reasoning, his experience, his imagination and his genius. These give his mental and moral physiognomy and make up his style.

But is not God free to act with or without these fixed laws? There are no circumstances which tinge his views or reasonings, and he has no idiosyncrasies of speech, and no mother tongue through which he expresses his character, or leaves the finger mark of genius upon his literary fabrics.

It is a great fallacy then, as Dr. Thomas Armitage once said, to suppose that uniformity of verbal style must have marked God's authorship in the Bible, had he selected its words. As the author of all styles, rather does he use them all at his pleasure. He bestows all the powers of mental individuality upon his instruments for using the Scriptures, and then uses their powers as he will to express his mind by them.

Indeed, the variety of style is a necessary proof of the freedom of the human writers, and it is this which among other things con-

vinces us that, however controlled by the Holy Spirit, they were not mere machines in what they wrote.

William Cullen Bryant was a newspaper man but a poet; Edmund Clarence Stedman was a Wall Street broker and also a poet. What a difference in style there was between their editorials and commercial letters on the one hand, and their poetry on the other! Is God more limited than a man?

4. *There are certain declarations of Scripture itself.* Does not Paul say in one or two places "I speak as a man," or "After the manner of man"? Assuredly, but is he not using the arguments common among men for the sake of elucidating a point? And may he not as truly be led of the Spirit to do that, and to record it, as to do or say anything else? Of course, what he quotes from men is not of the same essential value as what he receives directly from God, but the *record* of the quotation is as truly inspired.

There are two or three other utterances of his of this character in the 7th chapter of I Corinthians, where he is treating of marriage. At verse 6 he says, "I speak this by permission, not of commandment," and what he means has no reference to the source of his message but the subject of it. In contradiction to the false teaching of some, he says Christians are permitted to marry, but not commanded to do so. At verse 10 he says, "Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord," while at verse 12 there follows, "but to the rest speak I, not the Lord." Does he declare himself inspired in the first instance, and not in the second? By no means, but in the first he is alluding to what the Lord spake on the subject while here in the flesh, and in the second to what he, Paul is adding thereto on the authority of the Holy Spirit speaking through him. In other words, putting his own utterances on equality with those of our Lord, he simply confirms their inspiration.

At verse 40 he uses a puzzling expression, "I think also that I have the Spirit of God." As we are contending only for an inspired record, it would seem easy to say that here he records a doubt as to whether he was inspired, and hence everywhere else in the absence of such record of doubt the inspiration is to be assumed. But this would be begging the question, and we prefer the solution of others that the answer is found in the condition of the Corinthian

church at that time. His enemies had sought to counteract his teachings, claiming that they had the Spirit of God. Referring to the claim, he says with justifiable irony, "I think also that I have the Spirit of God" (A.S.V.). "I think" in the mouth of one having apostolic authority, says Professor Watts, may be taken as carrying the strongest assertion of the judgment in question. The passage is something akin to another in the same epistle at the 14th chapter, verse 37, where he says, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."

Time forbids further amplification on the difficulties and objections nor is it necessary, since there is not one that has not been met satisfactorily to the man of God and the child of faith again and again. Furthermore, it is safe to challenge the whole Christian world for the name of a man who stands out as a winner of souls who does not believe in the inspiration of the Bible as it has been sought to be explained in these pages.

But we conclude with a kind of concrete testimony — that of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America, and as long ago as 1893. The writer is not a Presbyterian, and therefore with the better grace can ask his readers to consider the character and the intellect represented in such an Assembly. Here are some of our greatest merchants, our greatest jurists, our greatest educators, our greatest statesmen, as well as our greatest missionaries, evangelists and theologians. There may be seen as able and august a gathering of representatives of Christianity in other places and on other occasions, but few that can surpass it. For sobriety of thought, for depth as well as breadth of learning, for wealth of spiritual experience, for honesty of utterance, and virility of conviction, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America must in this day command attention and respect throughout the world. And this is what it said on the subject we are now considering at its gathering in the city of Washington, the capital of the nation, at the date named:

"The Bible as we now have it, in its various translations and revisions, when freed from all errors and mistakes of translators, copyists and printers, (is) the very Word of God, and consequently wholly without error."

15

Inspiration

By *L. W. Munhall, M.A., D.D.*

Author of "The Highest Critics vs. the Higher Critics"

Revised and edited by Gerald B. Stanton, Th.D.

The Bible is inspired. It is therefore God's Word. This is fundamental to the Christian faith. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God" (Rom. 10:17).

But, it is asked, what do you mean by inspiration? Since there are many who insist that only the thoughts of Scripture, and not the words, are inspired this is a proper question.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in 1893, by a unanimous vote made the following deliverance: "The Bible as we now have it in its various translations and revisions when freed from all errors and mistakes of translators, copyists and printers, is the very Word of God, and consequently, wholly without error."

We mean by verbal inspiration that the words composing the Bible are God-breathed. If they were not, then the Bible is not inspired at all, since it is composed only and solely of words.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (II Tim. 3:16). The word rendered Scripture in this passage is *graphe*. It means writing, anything written. The writing is composed of words. What else is this but verbal inspiration; and they wrest the "Scriptures unto their own destruction," who teach otherwise.

Prof. A. A. Hodge says: "The line can never rationally be drawn between the thoughts and words of Scripture . . . That we have an inspired Bible, and a verbally inspired one, we have the witness of God himself."

Prof. Gaussen says: "The theory of a Divine Revelation, in which you would have the inspiration of thoughts, without the

inspiration of the language, is so inevitably irrational that it cannot be sincere, and proves false even to those who propose it."

Canon Westcott says: "The slightest consideration will show that words are as essential to intellectual processes as they are to mutual intercourse . . . Thoughts are wedded to words as necessarily as soul to body. Without it the mysteries unveiled before the eyes of the seer would be confused shadows; with it, they are made clear lessons for human life."

Dean Burgon, a man of vast learning, says: "You cannot dissect inspiration into substance and form. As for thoughts being inspired, apart from the words which give them expression, you might as well talk of a tune without notes, or a sum without figures. No such theory of inspiration is even intelligible. It is as illogical as it is worthless, and cannot be too sternly put down."

This doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, in all its elements and parts, has always been the doctrine of the Church. Dr. Westcott has proved this by a copious catena of quotations from *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (in Appendix B to his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*). For example, he quotes Clemens Romanus as saying that the Scriptures are "the true utterances of the Holy Ghost."

Let us consider a few quotations from the Fathers: (1) Justin, speaking of the words of Scripture, says: "We must not suppose that the language proceeds from the men that are inspired, but from the Divine Word himself, who moves them. Their work is to announce that which the Holy Spirit proposes to teach, through them, to those who wish to learn the true religion." "The history Moses wrote was by the Divine Inspiration." And so, of all the Bible.

(2). Irenaeus. "The writers spoke as acted on by the Spirit. All who foretold the coming of Christ received their inspiration from the Son, for how else could Scripture 'testify' of him alone?" "Matthew might have written, 'The generation of Jesus was on this wise,' but the Holy Spirit, foreseeing the corruption of the truth, and fortifying us against deception says, through Matthew, 'The generation of Jesus the Messiah was on this wise.'" "The writers are beyond all falsehood," i.e., they are inerrant.

(3). Clement of Alexandria. "The foundations of our faith rest on no insecure basis. We have received them through God himself through the Scripture, not one jot or tittle of which shall pass away till all is accomplished, for the mouth of the Lord, the Holy Spirit, spoke it. He ceases to be a man who spurns the tradition of the Church, and turns aside to human opinions; for the Scriptures are truly holy, since they make us holy, God-like. Of these Holy Writings or Words, the Bible is composed. Paul calls them God-breathed (II Tim. 3:15, 16). The Sacred Writings consist of these holy letters or syllables, since they are "God-breathed." Again, "The Jews and Christians agree as to the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures but differ in interpretation. By our faith, we believe that every Scripture, since it is God-breathed, is profitable."

(4). Origen. "It is the doctrine acknowledged by all Christians, and evidently preached in the churches that the Holy Spirit, inspired the Saints, Prophets and Apostles, and was present in those he inspired at the Coming of Christ; for Christ, the Word of God, was in Moses when he wrote, and in the Prophets, and by his Spirit he did speak to them all things. The records of the Gospels are the Oracles of the Lord, pure Oracles purified as silver seven times tried. They are without error, since they were accurately written, by the cooperation of the Holy Spirit." "It is good to adhere to the words of Paul and the Apostles as to God and our Lord Jesus Christ. There are many writings, but only one Book; four Evangelists, but only one Gospel. All the Sacred Writings breathe the same fullness. There is nothing, in the Law, the Prophets, the Gospel, the Apostles, that did not come from the fullness of God."

(5). Augustine. The view of the Holy Scriptures held by Augustine was that held by Tertullian, Cyprian and all Fathers of the North African Church. No view of verbal inspiration could be more rigid. "The Scriptures are the letters of God, the voice of God, the writings of God," "The writers record the words of God. Christ spoke by Moses, for he was the Spirit of the Creator, and all the prophecies are the voice of the Lord. From the Spirit came the gift of tongues. All Scripture is profitable since it is inspired of God. The Scriptures, whether in History, Prophecy,

Psalms or Law are of God. They cannot stand in part and fall in part. They are from God, who spake them all." "As it was not the Apostles who spoke, but the Spirit of the Father in them, so it is the Spirit that speaks in all Scriptures." "It avails nothing what I say, what he says but what saith the Lord."

Prof. B. B. Warfield, of Princeton Theological Seminary, summarizes the case in an article on The Westminster Doctrine of Inspiration: "Doubtless enough has been said to show that the confession teaches precisely the doctrine which is taught in the private writings of the framers which was also the General Protestant Doctrine of the time, and not of that time only or of the Protestants only; for despite the contrary assertion that has recently become tolerably current, essentially this doctrine of inspiration (verbal) has been the doctrine of the Church of all ages and of all names."

Some Proofs of Verbal Inspiration

The Bible plainly teaches that its words are inspired, and that it is the Word of God. Let us examine into this matter a little, by considering briefly three kinds of evidence.

First. Let us note the direct testimony of the Bible to the fact of verbal inspiration.

"And Moses said unto the Lord, I am not eloquent [a man of words], neither heretofore nor since thou hast spoken unto thy servant: for I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue. And the Lord said unto him, Who hath made man's mouth? . . . Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt speak" (Ex. 4:10-12), "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee, and with Israel" (Ex. 34:27). "And he said, Hear now my words: if there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream . . . With him [Moses] will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold" (Num. 12:6, 8). "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it" (Deut. 4:2). "But the prophet which shall speak a word presumptuously in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, . . . that prophet shall die" (Deut. 18:20).

In Mark 12:36, Jesus said: "David himself said in the Holy Spirit." If we turn to II Samuel 23:2, we will find what it was David said: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was upon my tongue."

Jeremiah said: "Ah! Lord God! behold I cannot speak, for I am a child. But the Lord saith unto me, Say not I am a child, for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces, for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord. Then the Lord put forth his hand and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth" (Jer. 1:6-9).

Balaam was compelled to speak against his will. He said: "Lo, I am come unto thee; have I now any power at all to say anything? the word that God putteth in my mouth, that shall I speak." He did his very utmost to curse the Israelites, but as often as he tried it, he blessed them. Balak at last said, "Neither curse them at all, nor bless them at all." But Balaam answered, "Told not I thee, saying, All the Lord speaketh, that must I do" (Num. 22:38; 23:26).

In the five books of Moses, in the books called historical, the books included under the general title of the Psalms, such expressions as the following occur hundreds of times: "Thus saith the Lord"; "The Lord said"; "The Lord spake"; "The Lord hath spoken"; "The saying of the Lord"; and "The word of the Lord." There is no other thought expressed in these books concerning inspiration than that the writers spoke and wrote the very words that God gave them.

Turning to the books called prophetical, we find Isaiah saying, "Hear the word of the Lord" (Isa. 1:10); and no fewer than twenty times does he explicitly declare that his writings are the "words of the Lord." Almost one hundred times does Jeremiah say, "The word of the Lord came unto me," or declare he was uttering the "words of the Lord," and the "word of the living God." Ezekiel says that his writings are the "words of God" quite sixty times. Here is a sample: "Son of man, all my words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thine heart, and hear with thine ears. And go get thee to them of the captivity, unto the children of thy

people, and speak unto them, and tell them, Thus saith the Lord God" (Ezek. 3:10-11). Daniel said, "And when I heard the voice of his words" (Dan. 10:9). Hosea said, "The word of the Lord" (Hosea 1:1). "The word of the Lord that came to Joel" (Joel 1:1). Amos said "Hear the word of the Lord" (Amos 3:1). Obadiah said, "Thus saith the Lord God" (Oba. 1:1). "The word of the Lord came unto Jonah" (Jonah 1:1). "The word of the Lord that came to Micah" (Micah 1:1). Nahum said, "Thus saith the Lord" (Nah. 1:12). Habakkuk wrote, "The Lord answered me and said" (Hab. 2:2). "The word of the Lord which came to Zephaniah" (Zeph. 1:1). "Came the word of the Lord by Haggai the prophet" (Hag 1:1). "Came the word of the Lord unto Zechariah" (Zech. 1:1). "The word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi" (Mal 1:1). And in this last of the Old Testament books, is it twenty-four times said, "Thus saith the Lord."

Next The words Jesus himself uttered were inspired. The words he spoke were not his own, but actually put into his mouth. In the most express manner it was foretold that Christ should thus speak, just as Moses spake. "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up, like unto me. To him ye shall hearken." Twice it is said, "like unto me." And how like to Moses, except as the whole context shows, "like unto him in verbal inspiration?" To Moses God said: "I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what to say. Thou shalt put words in Aaron's mouth, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach you what you shall say. And he shall be thy spokesman to the people. And he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God" (Ex. 4:11-16). Therefore did Jesus, as Prophet, utter inspired words "like unto Moses." The very words he spoke God put into his mouth and on his tongue. Therefore did he say, assuring the Jews that Moses wrote of him: "I have not spoken from myself, but the Father who sent me gave me commandment what I should say and what I should speak. I speak therefore even as the Father said to me, even so I speak" (John 12:49, 50). "I have given unto them the words Thou gavest Me, and they have received them" (John 17:8). "The Son can do nothing from himself" (5:19). Since Jesus Christ was divinely helped, "like unto Moses," the very words

put into his mouth, how should not the Evangelists and Apostles need the same divine guidance and help to qualify them for their work, and guarantee its inerrant truthfulness and its divine authority? If Moses and Isaiah, if Jesus Christ himself, had to be divinely assisted, how should the narrators of New Testament history and oracles be exempted from the same divine activity of the Spirit, all-controlling and guiding into the full truth?

Jesus said to the disciples, "And when they lead you to the judgment, and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost" (Mark 13:11).

This same gift included all the disciples on the day of Pentecost, for "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts 2:1, 4). The multitude that heard "marveled, saying, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own language? . . . We do hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God" (Acts 2:7, 11).

Paul says: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth" (I Cor. 2:13). "And for this cause we also thank God without ceasing, that, when ye received from us the word of the message even the word of God, ye accepted it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God" (I Thess. 2:13).

So the Bible uniformly teaches the doctrine of verbal inspiration. It is the Word of God. This is the invariable testimony of the Book itself. It never, in a single instance, says that the mere thoughts of the writers were inspired; or, that these writers had a "concept." The Scriptures are called "the oracles of God" (Rom. 3:2); "the Word of God" (Luke 8:11); "the Word of the Lord" (Acts 13:48); "the Word of life" (Phil. 2:16); "the Word of Christ" (Col. 3:16); "the Word of truth" (Eph. 1:13); "the Word of faith" (Rom. 10:8); and, by these and similar statements, do they declare, more than two thousand times, that the Bible is the Word of God — that the words are God-breathed, are inspired.

Second. What of the inferential testimony to the fact of verbal inspiration? I mean by inferential testimony that which is assumed by the Bible, and the natural implication belonging to many of its statements.

The Bible assumes to be from God in that it meets man face to face with drawn sword and says: "Thou shalt!" and "Thou shalt not!" and demands immediate, unconditional and irreversible surrender to the authority of heaven, and submission to all the laws and will of God, as made known in its pages. This of itself would not signify a great deal, though unique, were it not for the striking and significant results of such submission; but, the natural inference of such assumption is, that the words of demand and command are from God.

A great many statements of the Bible plainly indicate that the words are inspired. The following are a few instances: "Forever, O Lord, thy Word is settled in heaven" (Psa. 119:89). This is characteristic of the entire Psalm. "The words of the Lord are pure words" (Psa. 12:6). "Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" (Jer. 23:29). "The Word of our God shall stand forever" (Isa. 40:8); and so on, almost *ad infinitum*. Everywhere in the sacred record you find this same suggestion of divine authorship. Jesus and the Apostles always recognized it, and gave it prominence and emphasis. Its importance and value should not be underestimated.

Third. The resultant testimony. What of it? Paul tells us that "every sacred writing" is God-breathed. "No prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved (pheromenoi, borne along) by the Holy Spirit" (II Pet. 1:21). "This passage does not justify the so-called 'mechanical theory of inspiration.' Such theory is nowhere taught in the Scriptures. Indeed, the obvious fact that the individual characteristics of the writers were in no way changed or destroyed, disproved such theory. It is said: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7). Elihu said, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life" (Job 33:4). Now, then, the very same almighty power that gave life to Adam and Elihu, and which made the

"Heavens . . . and all the host of them," is, in some mysterious sense, in the words of the Sacred Record. Therefore are we told: "For the Word of God is living and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12). What results will follow believing the Word and submission to its requirements?

1. It will impart spiritual life and save the soul. "Receive with meekness the implanted Word, which is able to save your souls" (James 1:21). "Having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the Word of God, which liveth and abideth" (I Pet. 1:23). "Of his own will begat he us by the word of truth" (James 1:18). Jesus said: "The words I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life" (John 6:63).

As a good seed contains the germ of life, so that when cast into the soil of earth at the proper season, under the influence of sunshine and showers, it germinates and springs up to reproduce itself in kind; even so the words of the Bible, if received into the mind and heart to be believed and obeyed, germinate, and spiritual life is the result, reproducing its kind; and that believing soul is made partaker of the Divine nature (II Pet. 1:4). "He is a new creature [creation]; the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new" (II Cor. 5:17). The power and life of the Almighty lie hidden in the words of the Sacred Record; they are God-breathed, and that power and life will be manifest in the case of every one who will receive them with meekness, believing them and submitting to their requirements. All the books men have written cannot do this.

2. It has cleansing power. "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy word" (Psa. 119:9). Jesus said: "Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you" (John 15:3). "That he might sanctify it, having cleansed it, by the washing of water with the Word" (Eph. 5:26).

3. By the Word we are kept from evil and the power of the evil one. The Psalmist said: "By the words of thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer" (Psa. 17:4); and, "Thy

word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against thee" (Psa. 119:11). Therefore, Jesus said: "I have given them thy word . . . Sanctify them through [in] the truth. Thy word is truth" (John 17:14, 17).

The voice said: Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field . . . The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand forever" (Isa. 40:6, 8). "For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth" (II Cor. 13:8).

This, then, is the sum of our contention: The Bible is made up of writings, and these are composed of words. The words are inspired — God-breathed. Therefore is the Bible inspired — is God's Word.

This is plainly seen, first, in the uniform declaration of the Book. All the Old Testament prophets, Jesus our Lord, and all the New Testament writers, bear the same testimony concerning this transcendently important matter. Not a single word or thought to the contrary can anywhere be found in all their declarations. The attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament and his utterances confirm beyond question our contention. He had the very same Old Testament we have today. He believed it to be the Word of God, and proclaimed it as such. He said, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the laws, till all be fulfilled." In thwarting the tempter he said: "It is written! it is written! it is written!" In confounding the Jews, he said: "If ye believed Moses ye would believe me, for he wrote of me." He never criticized the Scriptures, but always appealed to them as his Father's words, authoritative and final.

Jesus is the life and the light of man. The same is true of the Scriptures. Jesus said: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." The Psalmist said, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." In an inexplicable way Jesus is identified with the Word. "The word was God . . . and the word became flesh." And when the victories of the Gospel shall have been finally accomplished, and Jesus shall assert his regal rights, his name is called, "The Word of God" (see Rev. 19:11, 13).

Second. The Bible assumes to be God's Word by its imperious demands. Who but God has a right to require of men what the Bible does?

Third. The Bible has fulfilled all its claims and promises. The marvelous, far-reaching results of proclaiming and believing it, demonstrably prove its supernatural origin and character.

That there are difficulties, I well enough know. But many difficulties have disappeared as a result of patient, reverent, scholarly research; and without doubt others will soon go the same way. So, while I bid the scholars and reverent critics God-speed in their noble work, with the late learned Bishop Ryle I say: "Give me the plenary verbal theory with all its difficulties, rather than the doubt. I accept the difficulties, and humbly wait for their solution; but while I wait I am standing on a rock."

Let this, then, be our attitude, to tell it out to the wide world that the blessed Bible, the "Holy Scriptures" of both Testaments, are the product of the "breath of God," who made heaven and earth, and "breathed" into man His soul; the product of that divine "breath" that regenerates, that illuminates and sanctifies the soul; a "God-breathed Scriptures," whose "words" are the "words of God." Tell it to the Church in her seminaries, universities and colleges, from her pulpits, Sunday Schools and Bible classes, and sound it in every convention, conference and assembly that her conception and estimate of the Scriptures must be no lower and no less than were the high conception and estimate of the "Volume of the Book" by our Lord and his Apostles. That which they regarded as the "Breath of God," she must so regard in opposition to every breath of man that dares to breathe otherwise. Say, with the immortal Athanasius, who knew how to read Greek better than the "drift of scholarly opinion"; "O my child, not only the ancient, but the new Scriptures are God-breathed, as Paul saith, 'Every Scripture is God-breathed.'" Say to the rising ministry, "Speak as the Oracles of God speak" — the words that "God hath spoken," the words that Christ has written. Tell it to every reader and hearer of the Word, that what "Moses saith" and "David saith" and "Isaiah, Peter, Paul, John and the Scripture saith," is what "God saith." Tell it to the dying saint, when his last pulse quivers at the wrist, and friends are weeping by his bed,

and "Science" has exhausted in vain all her poor resources, that God, who breathed the Scriptures, "cannot lie," that Jesus is a Rock and that the "firm Foundation" laid in the Word for his faith can never disappoint his trust. To every question of exegesis or of criticism, return the answer, "What saith the Scriptures?" "How readest thou?" "It is written!" And cease to deride the most sacred, age-established, and time-honored tradition the Apostolic Church has left us. With such an *attitude* as this, the days will revisit the Church as once they were "in the beginning," and God, honored in his Word, will no longer restrain the Spirit, but open the windows of heaven and pour upon her a blessing so great that there will not be room to receive it. God hasten the day!

16

The Moral Glory of Jesus Christ a Proof of Inspiration

By Rev. Wm. G. Moorehead, D.D.

President of Xenia Theological Seminary, Xenia, Ohio

Abridged and emended by James H. Christian, Th.D.

The glories of the Lord Jesus Christ are threefold: essential, official and moral. His essential glory is that which pertains to him as the Son of God, the equal of the Father. His official glory is that which belongs to him as the Mediator. It is the reward conferred on him, the august promotion he received when he had brought his great work to a final and triumphant conclusion. His moral glory consists of the perfections which marked his earthly life and ministry; perfections which attached to every relation he sustained, and to every circumstance in which he was found. His essential and official glories were commonly veiled during his earthly sojourn. His moral glory could not be hid; he could not be less than perfect in everything; it belonged to him; it was himself. The moral glory now illumines every page of the four Gospels, as once it did every path he trod.

The thesis which we undertake to illustrate and establish is this: That the moral glory of Jesus Christ as set forth in the four Gospels cannot be the product of the unaided human intellect, that only the Spirit of God is competent to execute this matchless portrait of the Son of Man. The discussion of the theme falls into two parts: I. A brief survey of Christ's moral glory as exhibited in the Gospels. II. The application of the argument.

I. CHRIST'S MORAL GLORY

The Humanity of Jesus

1. The moral glory of Jesus appears in his development as Son of Man. The nature which he assumed was our nature, sin and sinful propensities only excepted. His was a real and a true

humanity, one which must pass through the various stages of growth like any other member of the race. From infancy to youth, from youth to manhood, there was steady increase both of his bodily powers and mental faculties; but the progress was orderly.

As Son of Man he was compassed about with the sinless infirmities that belong to our nature. He had needs common to all; need of food, of rest, of human sympathy, and of divine assistance. He was subject to Joseph and Mary, he was a worshiper in the synagogue and the Temple; he wept over the guilty and hardened city, and at the grave of a loved one; he expressed his dependence on God by prayer.

Nothing is more certain than that the Gospel narratives present the Lord Jesus as a true man, a veritable member of our race. But we no sooner recognize this truth, than we are confronted by another which sets these records alone and unapproachable in the field of literature. This second fact is this: At every stage of his development, in every relation of life, in every part of his service he is absolutely perfect. To no part of his life does a mistake attach, over no part of it does a cloud rest, nowhere is there defect. Nothing is more striking, more unexampled, than the profound contrast between Jesus and the conflict and discord around him, than between him and those who stood nearest him, the disciples, John Baptist, and the mother, Mary. All fall immeasurably below him.

The Pattern Man

2. The Gospels exalt our Lord infinitely above all other men as the representative, the ideal, the pattern man. Nothing in the judgment of historians stands out so sharply distinct as race, national character — nothing is more ineffaceable. The very greatest men are unable to free themselves from the influences amid which they have been born and educated. Peculiarities of race and the spirit of the age leave in their characters traces that are imperishable. To the last fiber of his being Luther was German, Calvin was French, Knox was Scotch; Augustine bears the unmistakable impress of the Roman, and Chrysostom is as certainly Greek. Paul, with all his large-heartedness and sympathies was a Jew, always a Jew. Jesus Christ is the only one who

is justly entitled to be called the Catholic Man. Nothing local, transient, individualizing, national, or sectarian dwarfs the proportions of his wondrous character. "He rises above the parentage, the blood, the narrow horizon which bounded, as it seemed, his life; for he is the archetypal man in whose presence distinctions of race, intervals of ages, types of civilization and degrees of mental culture are as nothing" (Liddon). He belongs to all ages, he is related to all men, whether they shiver amid the snows of the arctic circle, or pant beneath the burning heat of the equator; for he is the Son of mankind, the genuine offspring of the race.

Unselfishness and Dignity

3. The Lord's moral glory appears in his unselfishness and personal dignity. The entire absence of selfishness in any form from the character of the Lord Jesus is another remarkable feature of the Gospels. He had frequent and fair opportunities of gratifying ambition had his nature been tainted with that passion. But "even Christ pleased not himself"; he "sought not his own glory"; he came not "to do his own will." His body and soul with all the faculties and activities of each were devoted to the supreme aims of his mission. His self-sacrifice included the whole range of his human thought, affection, and action; it lasted throughout his life; its highest expression was his ignominious death on the cross of Calvary.

The strange beauty of his unselfishness as it is displayed in the Gospel narratives appears in this, that it never seeks to draw attention to itself, it deprecates publicity. In his humility he seems as one naturally contented with obscurity; as wanting the restless desire for eminence which is common to really great men; as eager and careful that even his miracles should not add to his reputation. But amid all his self-sacrificing humility he never loses his personal dignity nor the self-respect that becomes him. He receives ministry from the lowly and the lofty; he is sometimes hungry, yet feeds the multitudes in desert places; he has no money, yet he never begs, and he provides the coin for tribute to the government from a fish's mouth. He may ask for a cup of water at the well, but it is that he may save a soul. He never flies from enemies; he quietly withdraws or passes by unseen. Hostility neither excites

nor exasperates him. He is always calm, serene. He seems to care little for himself, for his own ease or comfort or safety, but everything for the honor and the glory of the Father. If multitudes, eager and expectant, press upon him, shouting, "Hosanna to the son of David," he is not elated; if all fall away, stunned by his words of power, he is not cast down. He seeks not a place among men; he is calmly content to be the Lord's Servant, the obedient and the humble one. It is invariably true of him that he pleased not himself."

And yet through all his amazing self-renunciation, there glances ever and anon something of the infinite majesty and supreme dignity which belong to him because he is the Son of God. The words of Van Oosterzee are as true as they are beautiful and significant: "It is the same King's Son who today dwells in the palace of his Father, and tomorrow, out of love to his rebellious subjects in a remote corner of the Kingdom, renouncing his princely glory, comes to dwell amongst them in the form of a servant . . . and is known only by the dignity of his look, and the star of royalty on his breast, when the mean cloak is opened for a moment, apparently by accident."

Superiority to Human Judgment and Intercession

4. The Gospels exhibit the Lord Jesus as superior to the judgment and the intercession of men. When challenged by the disciples and by enemies, as he often was, Jesus never apologized, never excused himself, never confessed to a mistake. When the disciples, terrified by the storm on the lake, awoke him saying, "Master, carest thou not that we perish?", he did not vindicate his sleep, nor defend his apparent indifference to their fears. Martha and Mary, each in turn, with profound grief, say, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." But Jesus did not excuse his not being there, nor his delay of two days in the place where he was when the urgent message of the sisters reached him. In the consciousness of the perfect rectitude of his ways, he only replied, "Thy brother shall rise again." Peter once tried to admonish him, saying, "This be far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee." But Peter had to learn that it was Satan that prompted the admonition. Nor did he recall a word when the Jews rightly

inferred from his language that he "being man made himself God" (John 10:30-36). He pointed out the application of the name Elohim implied that his title to divinity is higher than, and distinct in kind from, that of the Jewish magistrates. He thus arrived a second time at the assertion which had given so great offense, by announcing his identity with the Father, which involves his own proper deity. The Jews understood him. He did not retract what they accounted blasphemy, and they again sought his life.

So likewise he is superior to human intercession. He never asked even his disciples nor his nearest friends, and certainly never his mother Mary, to pray for him. In Gethsemane he asked the three to watch with him, he did not ask them to pray for him. He bade them pray that they might not enter into temptation, but he did not ask them to pray that he should not, nor that he should be delivered out of it. Paul wrote again and again, "Brethren, pray for us" — "pray for me." But such was not the language of Jesus. In his intercession he never used plural personal pronouns in his petitions. He always said, "I" and "me," "these" and "them that thou hast given me."

The Sinlessness of Jesus

5. The sinlessness of the Saviour witnesses to his moral glory. The Gospels present us with one solitary and unique fact of human history — an absolutely sinless Man! Hear some witnesses. There is the testimony of his enemies. For three long years the Pharisees were watching their victim. As another writes, "There was the Pharisee mingling in every crowd, hiding behind every tree. They examined his disciples, they cross-questioned all around him. They looked into his ministerial life, into his domestic privacy, into his hours of retirement. They came forward with the sole accusation they could muster — that he had shown disrespect to Caesar. The Roman judge who ought to know, pronounced it void." There was another spy — Judas. Had there been one failure in the Redeemer's career, in his awful agony Judas would have remembered it for his comfort; but the bitterness of his despair, that which made his life intolerable, was, "I have betrayed the innocent blood."

There is the testimony of his friends. His disciples affirm that during their intercourse with him his life was unsullied. Had

Niebuhr, Morrison & Co.

there been a single blemish they would have detected it, and they would have recorded it, just as they did their own shortcomings and blunders. The purest and most austere man that lived in that day, John the Baptist, shrank from baptizing the Holy One, and in conscious unworthiness he said, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" Nor is his own testimony to be overlooked. Jesus never once confesses sin. He never once asks for pardon. Yet is it not he who so sharply rebukes the self-righteousness of the Pharisees? But yet he never lets fall a hint, he never breathes a prayer which implies the slightest trace of blameworthiness. He paints the doom of incorrigible and unrepentant sinners in the most dreadful colors found in the entire Bible, but he himself feels no apprehension, he expresses no dread of the penal future; his peace of mind, his fellowship with Almighty God is never disturbed nor interrupted. He challenges his bitterest enemies to convict him of sin (John 8:46). In Jesus Christ this self-revelation was not involuntary, nor accidental, nor forced: it was in the highest degree deliberate. There is about him an air of superior holiness, of aloofness from the world and its ways, a separation from evil in every form and of every grade, such as no other that has ever lived has displayed. Although descended from an impure ancestry, he brought no taint of sin into the world with him; and though he mingled with sinful men and was assailed by fierce temptations, he contracted no guilt, he was touched by no stain. He was not merely undefiled, but was undefilable. He came down into all the circumstances of actual humanity in its sin and misery, and yet he kept the infinite purity of heaven with him. In the annals of our race there is none next to or like him.

Assemblage and Correlation of Virtues

6. The exquisite assemblage and correlation of virtues and excellencies in the Lord Jesus form another remarkable feature of the Gospel narratives. There have been those who have displayed distinguished traits of character; those who by reason of extraordinary gifts have risen to heights which are inaccessible to the great mass of men. But who among the mightiest of men has shown himself to be evenly balanced and rightly poised in all his faculties and powers? In the very greatest and best, inequality and disproportion are encountered. In Jesus Christ there is no uneven-

ness. In him there is no preponderance of the imagination over the feeling, of the intellect over the imagination, of the will over the intellect. There is in him an uninterrupted harmony of all the powers of body and soul, in which that serves which should serve, and that rules which ought to rule, and all works together to one adorable end. In him every grace is in its perfectness, none in excess, none out of place, and none wanting. His justice and his mercy, his peerless love and his truth, his holiness and his freest pardon never clash; one never clouds the other. His firmness never degenerates into obstinacy, or his calmness into indifference. His gentleness never becomes weakness, nor his elevation of soul forgetfulness of others. In his best servants virtues and graces are uneven and often clash. Paul had hours of weakness and even of petulance. John the Apostle of love even wished to call down fire from heaven to consume the inhospitable Samaritans. And the virgin mother must learn that even she cannot dictate to him as to what he shall do or not do.

In his whole life one day's walk never contradicts another, one hour's service never clashes with another. While he shows he is master of nature's tremendous forces, and the Lord of the unseen world, he turns aside and lays his glory by to take little children in his arms and to bless them. "He never speaks where it would be better to keep silence, He never keeps silence where it would be better to speak; and he always leaves the arena of controversy a victor."

Omnipotence and Omniscience

7. The evangelists do not shrink from ascribing to the Lord Jesus divine attributes, particularly omnipotence and omniscience. They do so as a mere matter of fact, as what might and should be expected from so exalted a personage as the Lord Jesus was. How amazing the power is which he wields when it pleases him to do so! It extends to the forces of nature. At his word the storm is hushed into a calm, and the raging of the sea ceases. At his pleasure he walks on the water as on dry land. It extends to the world of evil spirits. At his presence demons cry out in fear and quit their hold on their victims. His power extends into the realm of disease. Every form of sickness departs at his command,

and he cures the sick both when he is beside them and at a distance from them. Death likewise, that inexorable tyrant that wealth has never bribed, nor tears softened, nor human power arrested, yielded instantly his prey when the voice of the Son of God bade him.

But Jesus equally as certainly and as fully possessed a superhuman range of knowledge as well as a superhuman power. Thus he saw into the depths of Nathaniel's heart when he was under the fig tree; he saw into the depths of the sea, and the exact coin in the mouth of a particular fish; he read the whole past life of the woman at the well, although he had never before met with her. John tells us, "He needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man" (John 2:25). He knew the world of evil spirits. He was perfectly acquainted with the movements of Satan and of demons. He said to Peter, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you that he might sift you as wheat: I made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not" (Luke 22:31, 32). He often spoke directly to the evil spirits that had control of people, ordering them to hold their peace, to come out and to enter no more into their victims. He knew the Father as no mere creature could possibly know him. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son, willeth to reveal him" (Matt. 11:27).

II. THE APPLICATION OF THE ARGUMENT

Nothing is more obvious than the very commonplace axiom, that every effect requires an adequate cause. Here are four brief records of our Lord's earthly life. They deal almost exclusively with his public ministry; they do not profess even to relate all that he did in his official work (cf. John 21:25). The authors of these memorials were men whose names are as household words the world over; but beyond their names we know little more. The first was tax collector under the Roman government; the second was, it is generally believed, that John Mark who for a time served as an attendant on Paul and Barnabas, and who afterward became the companion and fellow-laborer of Peter; the third was a physician and the devoted friend and co-worker of Paul; and the fourth was

a fisherman. Two of them, Matthew and John, were disciples of Jesus; whether the others, Mark and Luke, ever saw him during his earthly sojourn cannot be determined.

These four men, unpracticed in the art of writing, unacquainted with the ideals of antiquity, write the memorials of Jesus' life. Three of them traverse substantially the same ground, record the same incidents, discourses and miracles. While they are penetrated with the profoundest admiration for their Master, they never once dilate on his great qualities. All that they do is to record his actions and his discourses with scarcely a remark. One of them, indeed, John, intermingles reflective commentary with the narrative; but in doing this he carefully abstains from eulogy and panegyric. He pauses in his narrative only to explain some reference, to open some deep saying of the Lord, or to press some vital truth. Yet, despite this absence of the smallest attempt to delineate a character, these four men have accomplished what no others have done or can do — they have presented the world with the portrait of a Divine Man, a glorious Saviour. Matthew describes him as the promised Messiah, the glory of Israel, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham; the One in whom the covenants and the promises find their ample fulfillment; the One who accomplishes all righteousness. Mark exhibits him as the mighty Servant of Jehovah who does man's neglected duty, and meets the need of all around. Luke depicts him as the Friend of man, whose love is so intense and comprehensive, whose pity is so divine, that his saving power goes forth to Jew and Gentile, to the lowliest and the loftiest, to the publican, the Samaritan, the ragged prodigal, the harlot, the thief, as well as to the cultivated, the moral, the great. John presents him as the Son of God, the Word made flesh; as Light for a dark world, as Bread for a starving world, as Life for a dead world. Matthew writes for the Jew, Mark for the Roman, Luke for the Greek, and John for the Christian; and all of them write for every kindred, and tribe, and tongue and people of the entire globe, and for all time! What the philosopher, the poet, the scholar, the artist could not do; what men of the greatest mind, the most stupendous genius have failed to do, these four unpracticed men have done — they have presented

to the world the Son of Man and the Son of God in all his perfections and glories.

A Fact to be Explained

How comes it to pass that these unlearned and ignorant men (Acts 4:13) have so thoroughly accomplished so great a task? Let us hold fast our commonplace axiom, every effect must have an adequate cause. What explanation shall we give of this marvellous effect? Shall we ascribe their work to genius? But multitudes of men both before and since their day have possessed genius of the very highest order; and these gifted men have labored in fields akin to this of our four evangelists. The mightiest minds of the race — men of Chaldea, of Egypt, of India, of China, and of Greece — have tried to draw a perfect character, have expended all their might to paint a god-like man. And with what result? Either he is invested with the passions and the brutalities of fallen men, or he is a pitiless and impassive spectator of the world's sorrows and woes. In either case, the character is one which may command the fear but not the love and confidence of men.

Again, we ask, How did the evangelists solve this mighty problem of humanity with such perfect originality and precision? Only two answers are rationally possible: 1. They had before them the personal and historical Christ. Men could no more invent the God-man of the Gospels than they could create a world. The almost irreverent words of Theodore Parker are grounded in absolute truth: "It would have taken a Jesus to forge a Jesus." 2. They wrote by inspiration of the Spirit of God. It cannot be otherwise. It is not enough to say that the divine model was before them: they must have had something more, else they never could have succeeded.

Let it be assumed that these four men, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, were personally attendant on the ministry of Jesus — that they saw him, heard him, companied with him for three years. Yet on their own showing they did not understand him. They testify that the disciples, the apostles among the number, got but the slenderest conceptions of his person and his mission from his very explicit teachings. They tell us of a wonderful incapacity and weakness in all their apprehensions of him. The Sun of Righteousness was

shining on them and around them, and they could see only the less! He told them repeatedly of his approaching death, and of his resurrection, but they did not understand him; they even questioned among themselves what the rising from the dead should mean (Mark 9:10) — poor men! And yet these men, once so blind and ignorant, write four little pieces about the person and the work of the Lord Jesus which the study and the research of Christendom for nineteen hundred years have not exhausted, and which the keenest and most hostile criticism has utterly failed to discredit.

But this is not all. Others have tried their hand at composing the Life and Deeds of Jesus. Compare some of these with our Four Gospels.

Spurious Gospels

The Gospel narrative observes an almost unbroken silence as to the long abode of Jesus at Nazareth. Of the void thus left the church became early impatient. During the first four centuries many attempts were made to fill it up. Some of these apocryphal gospels are still extant, notably that which deals with the infancy and youth of the Redeemer; and it is instructive to notice how those succeeded who tried to lift the veil which covers the earlier years of Christ. Let another state the contrast between the New Testament records and the spurious gospels: "The case stands thus: our Gospels present us with a glorious picture of a mighty Saviour, the mythic gospels with that of a contemptible one. In our Gospels he exhibits a superhuman wisdom; in the mythic ones a nearly equal superhuman absurdity. In our Gospels he is arrayed in all the beauty of holiness; in the mythic ones this aspect of character is entirely wanting. In our Gospels not one strain of sinfulness defiles his character; in the mythic ones the boy Jesus is both pettish and malicious. Our Gospels exhibit to us a sublime morality; not one ray of it shines in those of the mythologists. The miracles of the one and of the other stand contrasted on every point" (Row).

These spurious gospels were written by men who lived not long after the apostolic age; by Christians who wished to honor the Saviour in all they said about him; by men who had the portraiture of him before them which the Gospels supply. And yet these men,

many of them better taught than the apostles, with the advantage of two or three centuries of Christian thought and study, could not produce a sketch of the Child Jesus without violating our sense of propriety, and shocking our moral sense. The distance between the Gospels of the New Testament and the Pseudo-gospels is measured by the distance between the product of the Spirit of God, and that of the fallen human mind.

Uninspired "Lives of Christ"

Let us take another illustration. The nineteenth century has been very fruitful in the production of what are commonly called "Lives of Christ." Contrast with the Gospels four such "Lives," perhaps the completest and the best, taken altogether, of those written by English-speaking people — Andrews', Geikie's, Hanna's, and Edersheim's. Much information and helpfulness are to be derived from the labors of these Christian scholars, and others who have toiled in the same field; but how far they all fall below the New Testament record it is needless to show.

Let the contrast be noted as to size or bulk. The four combined have no less than 5,490 pages, enough in these busy days to require months of reading to go but once through their contents. Bagster prints the four Gospels in 82 pages; the American Revised in about 100 pages of the four Gospels against more than five thousand four hundred of the four "Lives."

How happens it that such stores of wisdom and knowledge lie garnered in these short pieces? Who taught the evangelists this superhuman power of expansion and contraction, of combination and separation, of revelation in the words and more revelation below the words? There is but one answer to these questions, there can be no other. The Spirit of the living God filled their minds with his unerring wisdom and controlled their human speech. To that creative Spirit who has peopled the world with living organisms so minute that only the microscope can reveal their presence, it is not hard to give us in so brief a compass the sublime portrait of the Son of Man.

17

The Testimony of the Scriptures to Themselves

By Rev. George S. Bishop, D.D.

East Orange, New Jersey

Revised and edited by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

The subject under consideration in this chapter is the testimony of the Scriptures to themselves, that is, their own self-evidence, the overpowering, unparticipated witness that they bring. This witness can be treated under four heads: (1) Immortality, (2) Authority, (3) Transcendent Doctrine, and (4) Direct Assertion.

1. Immortality. All other books die. Few books survive, and of these fewer have any influence. Most of the books from which we quote have been written in recent times. But here is a book whose antemundane voices had grown old, when voices spoke in Eden. It is a book which has survived not only with continued, but increasing lustre, vitality, and influence. Through all the shocks it has come without a wrench, and through all the furnaces of the ages with every document in its place without the smell of smoke. Of this book it may be said, as of Christ himself: "Thou hast the dew of thy youth from the womb of the morning." It dates from days as old as the Ancient of Days, and when the universe is dissolved, it will still speak in thunder-tones of majesty and music-tones of love. It wraps in itself the everlasting past, and opens from itself the everlasting future, the one unchanging, changeless revelation of God.

2. Immortality is here, and authority sets her seal. It is useless to talk of no standard. Nature points to one; conscience cries out for one. There must be a standard and an inspired one; for inspiration is the essence of authority, and authority is in proportion to inspiration. Verbal inspiration is, therefore, the "Thermopylae" of Biblical faith. No breath, no syllable; no syllable, no word; no word, no book; no book, no religion. There can

be no possible advance in revelation no new light. What was written at first, the same stands written today, and will stand forever. The product of the mind of God is complete, perfect, final (Rev. 22:18, 19).

modern
 The Bible is the Word of God, not merely contains it. The Bible calls itself the Word of God, and by that very title is distinguished from all other books. If the Bible is not called the Word of God, then it cannot be called anything else. The Bible is the Word of God, because it comes from God; because its every word was penned by God; because it is the only exponent of God; the only rule of his procedure; and the only book by which all must at last be judged.

(1) The Bible is authority because throughout God is the speaker. In the Bible God speaks, God is listened to, and men are born again by God's Word (Rom. 10:17). (2) The Bible comes announced by miracles and heralded with fire. In the Old Testament it is Mount Sinai, in the New, Pentecost. Would God himself write on tables in the giving, and send down tongues of fire for the proclamation of a revelation, every particle of which was not his own? In short, would he work miracles and send fire to signalize a work merely human, or even partly human and partly divine? How unworthy of God, how utterly impossible the supposition!

(3) The Bible comes clothed with authority in the exalted terms of its address. God in the Bible speaks out of a whirlwind, with the voice of an Elijah, with the imperative tone of prophets and apostles which enabled them to brave and boldly teach the world from Pharaoh to Nero and beyond. See Jeremiah 20:9 and Amos 3:8. (4) The Bible is the height of authority, because it is from first to last a glorious projection on the widest scale of the decrees of God. The sweep of the Bible is from the creation of the angels to a new heaven and new earth, across a lake of fire. What a field for events! When the Bible is considered as an exact projection of the decrees of God into the future, this argument is seen to move to a climax; in fact, it does reach to the very crux of controversy. The hardest thing to believe about God is that he exactly, absolutely knows, because he has ordained,

the future. The attribute of infallible omniscience is hard to grasp, and it calls for direct inspiration.

(5) The Bible is the acme of authority, because the hooks at the end of the chain prove the inspiration of its every link. Compare the fall in Genesis with the resurrection in the Apocalypse. Compare the old creation in the first chapters of the Old Testament with the new creation in the last chapters of the New. One is the prologue, while the other is the epilogue of a vast, infinite drama.

(6) Another argument for the supreme authority of Scripture is the character of the investigation challenged for the Word of God. The Bible courts the closest scrutiny. Its open pages blaze the legend, "Search the Scriptures!" The Scriptures may be analyzed, sifted, pulverized as in a mortar to the last thought. Only a divine book would dare speak such a challenge. God has written it, and none can exhaust it. Apply your microscopes, apply your telescopes, to the Scriptures. They separate, but do not fray, its threads. They broaden out its nebulae, but find them clustered stars. With the Word of God it is the more scrutiny, the more divinity; the more dissection, the more perfection. It is impossible to bring to it a test too penetrating, nor a light too piercing, nor a touchstone too exacting.

3. In the third place, the Scriptures testify to their divine original by their transcendent doctrine, the glow of the divine, the witness of the Spirit. We should expect to find a book that came from God to be penciled with points of jasper and of sardine stone, enhaloed with a brightness from the everlasting hills. We should look for that about the book which, flashing conviction at once, should carry overwhelmingly and everywhere by its bare, naked witness, by what it simply is.

The Bible is the Word of God, because it is the book of infinites, the revelation of what nature never could have attained. The greatest need of the soul is salvation. It is such a knowledge of God as will assure us of comfort here and hereafter. Nature outside the Bible does not contain such a knowledge. Groping in his darkness, man is confronted by two changeless facts: his guilt and the justice of God. Nature helps to no bridge; it nowhere speaks of redemption.

The Scriptures are divine in their very message, because they deal with three infinites: infinite guilt, infinite holiness, and infinite redemption.

Infinite guilt! Has my guilt any bottom? Is hell any deeper? Infinitely guilty! That is what I am. As soon as the Bible declares it, I know it, and with it I know that witnessing Bible is divine. I know it by conscience, by illumination, by the power of the Spirit of God, by the Word, and by the flashed conviction in me which agree.

And counterpoised above me, a correlative infinite—God! What can be higher? What zenith loftier? Infinite God, above me, coming to judge me! I know it as soon as the Bible declares it.

Then the third and that which completes the triangle, and makes its sides eternally, divinely equal, infinite redemption, an infinite Saviour, God on the cross making answer to God on the throne, my Jesus, my Refuge, my Everlasting God. By these three infinites, especially the infinite redemption for which man's whole being cries out its last cry of exhaustion, the Bible proves itself the soul's geometry, the one eternal mathematics, the true revelation of God.

The Scriptures are their own self-evidence. The sun requires no critic, truth no diving-bell. When God speaks, his evidence is in the accent of his words. How did the prophets of old know, when God spoke to them, that it was God? Did they subject the voice, that shook their every bone, to a critical test? Did they put God, as it were, into a crucible, into a chemist's retort, in order to certify that he was God? Did they find it necessary to hold the handwriting of God in the light of anxious philosophical examination, in order to bring out and to make the invisible, visible? The very suggestion is madness.

4. In the fourth place, the Scriptures say of themselves that they are divine. They not only assume it; they say it. "Thus saith the Lord" is intrinsic, a witness inside of the witness. The argument from the self-assertion of Scripture is cumulative.

(1) The Bible claims that, as a book, it comes from God. In various ways it urges this claim. It says so (Heb. 1:1, 2). The question of inspiration is, in its first statement, the question of

revelation itself. The question is simply one of divine testimony, and our business is simply to receive that testimony. When God speaks, there is the whole of it. He is bound to be heard and obeyed.

In the Bible God speaks, and speaks not only by proxy. Again and again it is "the Lord spake." The self-announced speaker is God. God himself comes down and speaks, not in the Old Testament alone, and not alone by proxy. Christ everywhere received the Scripture, and speaks of the Old Testament in its entirety, the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, as the living oracle of God. He accepts and he endorses everything written, and even makes most prominent those miracles which infidelity regards as most incredible. And he does all this upon the ground of the authority of God. Too, this position of our Saviour, which exalted Scripture as the mouthpiece of the living God, was steadily maintained by the apostles and the apostolic church. Again and again in the Book of Acts and in all the epistles, the expression is "God saith," "he saith," and "the Holy Spirit saith."

(2) If the Scriptures are divine, then what they say of themselves is divine. Here two words constitute the apostolic keys to the church's position: "*graphe*" (writing) and "*theopneustos*" (God-breathed). The sacred assertion is not of the instruments, but of the author, not of the agents, but of the product. It is the sole and sovereign vindication of what has been left on the page when inspiration gets through. God inspires not men, but language. Holy men were moved, borne along, but their writing, what they put down on the page, was God-breathed. You breathe on a pane of glass. Your breath congeals there; stays there; fixes an ice-picture there. That is the idea. The writing on the page beneath the hand of Paul was just as much breathed on, breathed into that page, as was his soul breathed into Adam.

On the original parchment every sentence, word, line, mark, point, pen-stroke, jot, tittle was put there by God. There is no question of other, anterior parchments. Men may destroy the parchments. Time may destroy them, but the writing remains.

The Scriptures say that the laws the writers promulgated, the doctrines they taught, the accounts they recorded, their prophecies

Bonnell
+ Presb
say no

of Christ, were not their own, were not conceived by them from outside sources, but were immediately from God. Some of the speakers of the Bible, like Balaam and Caiaphas, are made to speak in spite of themselves. The prophets themselves did not know what they wrote (I Pet. 1:10, 11). That lifts the Bible from all human hands and places it back, as his original deposit, in the hands of God.

It is said that "the word of the Lord came" to such and such a writer. It is not said that the Spirit came, which is true; but that the Word itself came. It is denied, and most emphatically, that the words are the words of man, of the agent. "The word was in my tongue" (II Sam. 23:2). Paul asserts that "Christ spake in me" (II Cor. 13:3). Could language more plainly assert or defend a verbal, direct, and plenary inspiration?

The Scripture declares that holy men were moved, or rather carried along in a supernatural ecstatic current. They were not left one instant to their wit alone, their wisdom, fancies, memories, or judgments, either to order, arrange, dispose or write out. They were intelligent, conscious, exact, and accurate instruments. Ultimately, it was God who wrote the whole Bible.

The danger of our day, the decline in doctrine, conviction, moral sentiment—does it not find its first step in our lost hold upon the verbal, plenary inspiration of the Word of God? A fresh conviction here lies at the root of every remedy we desire, as its sad lack lies at the root of every ruin we deplore.

18

The Testimony of the Organic Unity of the Bible to Its Inspiration

by Arthur T. Pierson, D.D.

Revised and edited by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

The argument for the inspiration of the Bible to be presented is that drawn from its unity. This unity may be seen in several conspicuous particulars.

1. *The unity is structural.* In the book itself appears a certain archetypal, architechural plan. The two Testaments are built on the same general scheme. Each is in three parts: historic, didactic, prophetic; looking to the past, the present, and the future. Here is a collection of books; in their style and character there are great variety and diversity. Some are historical, others poetical; some contain laws, others lyrics; some are prophetic, some symbolic. In the Old Testament we have historical, poetical, and prophetic divisions; and in the New Testament we have historic narratives, then twenty-one epistles, then a symbolic apocalyptic poem in oriental imagery. Yet this is no artificial arrangement of fragments. We find "the Old Testament patent in the New; the New latent in the Old."

In such a book, then, it is not likely that there would be unity; for all the conditions were unfavorable to a harmonious moral testimony and teaching. Here are some sixty or more separate documents, written by some forty different persons, scattered over wide intervals of space and time, strangers to each other. These documents are written in three different languages, in different lands, among different and sometimes hostile peoples, with marked diversities of literary style, and by men of all grades of culture and mental capacity, from Moses to Malachi. When we look into these productions, there is even in them great unlikeness, both in matter and manner of statement; yet they all constitute one volume.

All are entirely at agreement. There is diversity in unity, and unity in diversity. The more we study it, the more do its unity and harmony appear. All the criticism of more than three thousand years has failed to point out one important or irreconcilable contradiction in the testimony and teachings of those who are farthest separated. There is no collision, yet there could be no collusion! How can this be accounted for? There is no answer which can be given unless you admit the supernatural element. If God actually superintended the production of this book, then its unity is the unity of a divine plan, and its harmony the harmony of a Supreme Intelligence.

The temple, first built upon Mount Moriah, was built of stone, made ready before it was brought thither. There was neither hammer nor ax nor any tool of iron heard in the house while it was in building. What insured symmetry in the temple when constructed, and harmony between the workmen in the quarries and shops, and the builders on the hill? One presiding mind planned the whole; one intelligence built that whole structure in ideal before it was in fact. Only so can we account for the structural unity of the Word of God. The structure was planned and wrought out in the mind of a divine architect, who superintended his own workmen and work. Everything is in agreement with everything else, because the whole Bible was built in the thought of God before one book was laid in order. The building rose steadily from cornerstone to capstone, foundations first, then story after story, pillars on pedestals, and capitals on pillars, and arches on capitals, till like a dome flashing back the splendors of the noonday, the Apocalypse spans and crowns and completes the whole, glorious with celestial visions.

2. *The unity is historic.* The whole Bible is the history of the kingdom of God. Israel represents that kingdom. All centers about the Hebrew nation. With their origin and progress the main historical portion begins; with their apostasy and captivity it stops. The times of the Gentiles filled the interval and have no proper history. Prophecy, which is history anticipated, takes up the broken thread, and gives us the outline of the future when Israel shall again take its place among the nations.

3. *The unity is dispensational.* There are certain uniform dispensational features which distinguish every new period. Each dispensation is marked by seven features in this order: (a) increased light; (b) decline of spiritual life; (c) union between believers and the world; (d) a gigantic civilization worldly in type; (e) parallel development of good and evil; (f) apostasy on the part of God's people; (g) concluding judgment. The same seven marks have been upon all alike, showing one controlling power, God in history.

4. *The unity is prophetic.* Of all prophecy there is but one center, the kingdom and the King. Adam, the first king, lost his scepter by sin. His probation ended in failure and disaster. The last Adam, in his probation, gained the victory, routed the tempter, and stood firm. The two comings of this King constituted the two focal centers of the prophetic ellipse. His first coming was to make possible an empire in man and over man. His second coming will be to set that empire up in glory. All prophecy moves about these advents. It touches Israel only as related to the kingdom; and the Gentiles only as related to Israel. There are some six hundred and sixty-six general prophecies in the Old Testament, three hundred and thirty-three of which refer particularly to the coming Messiah, and meet only in him.

5. *The unity is, therefore, also personal.* Hebrews 10:7. There is but one book, and within it but one person. Christ is the center of Old Testament prophecy, as he is of New Testament history. From Genesis 3 to Malachi 3, he fills out the historic and prophetic profile. Not only do the predictions unite in him, but even the rites and ceremonies find in him their only interpreter. Historic characters prefigure him, and historic events are pictorial illustrations of his vicarious ministry. The Old Testament is a lock of which Christ is the key. Beginning at any point you may preach Jesus.

6. *The unity is symbolic.* There is a corresponding use of symbols, whether in form, color, or numbers. In form, we have the square, the cube, and the circle, and they are used as types of the same truths. In color, there is the white for purity, the lustrous white for glory, the red for guilt of sin and the sacrifice for sin, the blue for truth and fidelity to promise, the purple for royalty,

666
333
Messiah

the pale or livid hue for death, and the black for woe and disaster. In numbers there is plainly a numerical system. One seems to represent unity, two correspondence and confirmation or contradiction; three is the number of Godhead; four of the world and man. Seven, the sum of three and four, stands for the combination of the divine and human; twelve the product of three and four, for the divine interpenetrating the human; ten, the sum of one, two, three, and four, is the number of completeness. Three and a half, the broken number, represents tribulation; six, which stops short of seven, is unrest; eight, which is beyond the number of rest, is the number of victory. All this implies one presiding mind, and it could not be man's mind.

7. *The unity is didactic.* In the entire range and scope of the ethical teaching of the Bible there is no inconsistency or adulteration. In not one respect are the doctrinal and ethical teachings in conflict from beginning to end; rather, we find in them a positive oneness of doctrine which amazes us. Even where at first glance there appears to be conflict, as between Paul and James, on closer examination it is found that, instead of standing face to face beating each other, they stand back to back, beating off common foes. We observe, moreover, a progressive development of revelation, not only from the Old Testament to the New but in the confines of the New itself. Most wonderful of all, this moral and didactic unity could not be fully understood till the book was completed. The progress of preparation, like a scaffolding about a building, obscured its beauty; but when John placed the capstone in position and declared that nothing further should be added, the scaffolding fell and a grand cathedral was revealed.

8. *The unity is scientific.* The Bible is not a scientific book, but it follows one consistent law. Like an engine on its own track, it thunders across the track of science, but is never diverted from its own. (1) No direct teaching or anticipation of scientific truth is found here. (2) No scientific fact is ever misstated, though common, popular phraseology may be employed. (3) An elastic set of terms is used, which contain in germ all scientific truth, as the acorn enfolds the oak. The language is so elastic and flexible as to contract itself to the narrowness of human ignorance, and yet expand itself to the dimensions of knowledge. If the Bible

may, from imperfect language, select terms which may hold hidden truths till ages to come shall disclose the inner meaning, that would seem to be the best solution of this difficult problem. Now when we come to compare the language of the Bible with modern science, we find just this to be the fact.

The general correspondence between the Mosaic account of creation and the most advanced discoveries of science, proves that only he who built the world, built the book. As to the order of creation, Moses and geology agree. Both teach that at first there was an abyss, or watery waste, whose dense vapors shut out light. Both make life to precede light; and the life to develop beneath the abyss. Both make the atmosphere to form an expanse by lifting watery vapors into cloud, and so separating the fountains of waters above from the fountains below. Both tell us that continents next lifted themselves from beneath the great deep, and brought forth grass, herbs, and tree. Both teach that the heavens became cleared of cloud, and the sun and moon and stars, which then appeared, began to serve to divide day from night, and to become signs for seasons and years. Both then represent the waters bringing forth moving and creeping creatures, and fowl flying in the expanse, followed next by the race of quadruped mammals, and, last of all, by man himself.

There is the same agreement as to the order of animal creation. Geology and comparative anatomy combine to teach that the order was from lower to higher types; first, the fish, then reptiles, then man. This is exactly the order of Moses. Take an example of this scientific accuracy from astronomy. Jeremiah in 30:22 said, "The host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured." Before the time of Christ the number was thought to be about 1,000; during the last century the number had increased to millions; and now we know they must be numbered in the billions. So the exclamation of the prophet, six centuries before Christ, more than 2,000 years before Galileo, proves to be not poetic exaggeration, but literal truth. Who was Jeremiah's teacher in astronomy?

9. *Last of all, the unity of the Bible is organic.* It is the unity of organized being. Organic unity implies three things: first,

that all parts are necessary to a complete whole; secondly, that all are necessary to complement each other; and thirdly, that all are pervaded by one life-principle. (1) Organic unity is dependent on the existence and cooperation of organs. An oratorio is not an organic unity, because any part of it may be separated from the rest, or displaced by a new composition. But if the human body loses an eye, a limb, or the smallest joint of the finger, it is permanently maimed; its completeness is gone. Not one of the books of the Bible could be lost without maiming the body of truth here contained. Every book fills a place; none can be omitted.

For example, the Book of Esther has long been criticized as not necessary to the completeness of the canon, particularly because it does not once mention the name of God. But that book is the completest exhibition of the providence of God. It teaches a divine hand behind human affairs, unbiased freedom of resolution and action as consistent with God's overruling sovereignty, and all things working together to produce grand results.

The Epistle to Philemon seems at first only a letter to a friend about a runaway slave. But this letter is full of illustrations of grace. The sinner has run away from God, and robbed him besides. The law allows him no right of asylum; but grace concedes him the privilege of appeal. Christ, God's Partner, intercedes. He sends him back to the Father, no more a slave but a son.

(2) The law of unity has been framed in scientific statement. Organized being in every case forms a whole, a complete system, all parts of which mutually correspond. None of these parts can change without the other also changing; and consequently, each taken separately indicates and gives all the others. The Four Gospels are necessary to each other and to the whole Bible. Each presents the subject from a different point of view, and the combination gives us a divine Person reflected, projected before us, like an object with proportions and dimensions. Matthew wrote for the Jew, and shows Jesus as the King of the Jews, the Royal Law-giver. Mark wrote for the Roman, and shows Him as the Power of God, the Mighty Worker. Luke wrote for Greek, and shows Him as the Wisdom of God, the human Teacher and Friend. John, writing to supplement and complement the other Gospels,

shows Him as Son of God, as well as Son of man, having and giving eternal life.

The Epistles are likewise all necessary to complete the whole and complement each other. There are five writers, each having his own sphere of truth. Paul's great theme is faith, and its relations to justification, sanctification, service, joy, and glory. James treats of works, their relation to faith, as its justification before man. He is the counterpart and complement of Paul. Peter deals with hope, as the inspiration of God's pilgrim people. John's theme is love, and its relation to the light and life of God as manifested in the believer. Jude sounds the trumpet of warning against apostasy, which implies the wreck of faith, the delusion of false hope, love grown cold, and the utter decay of good works. What one of all these writers could be dropped from the New Testament?

The unity of the Bible is the unity of one organic whole. The decalogue demands the Sermon on the Mount. Isaiah's prophecy makes necessary the narrative of the Evangelists. Daniel fits into the Revelation as bone fits socket. Leviticus explains, and is explained by, the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Psalms express the highest morality and spirituality of the Old Testament; they link the Mosaic code with the divine ethics of the Gospels and the Epistles. When you come to the last chapters of Revelation, you find yourself mysteriously touching the first chapters of Genesis; and lo! as you survey the whole track of your thought, you find you have been following the perimeter of a golden ring; the extremities actually bend around, touch, and blend.

(3) The life of God is in his Word. The Word is quick, living. Is it a mirror? yes, but such a mirror as the living eye. Is it a seed? yes, but a seed hiding the vitality of God. Is it a sword? yes, but a sword that omnisciently discerns and omnipotently pierces the human heart. Hold it reverently, for you have a living book in your hand. Speak to it, and it will answer you. Bend down and listen; you will hear in it the heart-throbs of God.

This book, thus one, we are to hold forth as the word of life and the light of God in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation. We shall meet opposition. Like the birds that beat them-

selves into insensibility against the light in the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, the creatures of darkness will assault this Word, and vainly seek to put out its eternal light. But they shall only fall stunned and defeated at its base, while it still rises from its rock pedestal, immovable and serene!

19

Fulfilled Prophecy a Potent Argument for the Bible

by Arno C. Gaebelin, D.D.

Late Editor, *Our Hope*, New York, City

Revised and edited by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

The challenge of the Lord to the idol-gods of Babylon was to predict future events. See Isaiah 41:21-23 and 46:10. God alone can declare the end from the beginning. The dumb idols of the heathen know nothing concerning the future, and man himself is powerless to find out things to come. However, the Lord, who made this challenge, has demonstrated his power to predict. None of the "sacred books" of the nations contains predictions of the future. If the authors of these writings had attempted to foretell the future, they would have furnished the strongest evidence of their deception. But the Bible is pre-eminently a book of prophecy. These predictions are declared to be the utterances of the Lord; they show that the Bible is a supernatural book, the revelation of God.

Prophecy Neglected and Denied

It is deplorable, then, that the professing church almost completely ignores or neglects the study of prophecy, resulting in the loss of one of the most powerful weapons against infidelity. The denial of the Bible as the inspired Word of God has become widespread. If prophecy were intelligently studied, such a denial could not flourish as it does, for the fulfilled predictions of the Bible give the clearest and most conclusive evidence that the Bible is the revelation of God.

Past, Present, and Future

The prophecies of the Bible may, first of all, be divided into three classes: (1) Prophecies which have found their fulfillment already. (2) Prophecies which are now in process of fulfillment. Many predictions written several thousand years ago are being

fulfilled. Among them are those which relate to the national and spiritual condition of Israel, and the predictions concerning the moral condition of the present age. (3) Prophecies which are still unfulfilled. Reference is to those which predict the second, glorious coming of our Lord, the regathering and restoration of Israel to the land of promise, judgments which await the nations of the earth, the establishment of the kingdom, the conversion of the world, universal peace and righteousness, the deliverance of creation, and others.

These great prophecies of future things are often robbed of their literal and solemn meaning by a process of spiritualization. The visions of the prophets concerning Israel and Jerusalem, and the glories to come in a future age, are almost generally explained as having their fulfillment in the church during the present age. However, our object is not to follow the unfulfilled prophecies, but prophecies fulfilled and in the process of fulfillment.

Fulfilled Prophecy a Vast Theme

Fulfilled prophecy is a vast theme of much importance. History bears witness to the fact that the events which have transpired among the nations were pre-written in the Bible. Attention will be directed to the fulfilled prophecies relating to the Person of Christ, the people of Israel, and a number of nations, whose history has been divinely foretold in the Bible. Furthermore, mention will be made of the prophetic unfoldings given in the Book of Daniel with their interesting fulfillment.

Messianic Prophecies and Their Fulfillment

The Old Testament contains a remarkable chain of prophecies concerning the Person, life, and work of our Lord. Radical destructive criticism has taken the position that there are no predictions concerning Christ in the Old Testament. Such a denial is linked with the denial of his deity and his work on the cross. To follow the large number of prophecies concerning the coming of Christ into the world, and the work he was to accomplish, is beyond the scope of these pages. However, highlights of Messianic prophecy will be pointed out. Christ is first announced in Genesis 3:15 as the seed of the woman, and therefore of the human race. In Genesis 9:26-27 the supremacy of Shem is predicted. In due

time Abraham, a son of Shem, received the promise that the predicted seed was to come from him (Gen. 12:8).

Then the fact was revealed that he was to come from Isaac and not from Ishmael, from Jacob and not from Esau. Divine prediction pointed to Judah and later to the house of David of the tribe of Judah whence Messiah should spring. The prophecies of Isaiah disclose that his mother was to be a virgin (Isa. 7:14); the virgin born son was to be Immanuel, God with us. Deity and humanity are united in the Messiah (Isa. 9:6). Messiah, the Son of David, was to appear (Isa. 11:1) after the house of David had been stripped of its royal dignity and glory.

There are prophecies which speak of his life, his poverty, the works he was to do, his rejection by his own people (Isa. 53). During the time of his rejection by Israel, the Gentiles would be visited by his salvation (Isa. 49:5, 6).

His sufferings and death are even more minutely predicted. In the Book of Psalms the sufferings of Christ, the deep agony of his soul, the expressions of his sorrow and his grief, are pre-written by the Spirit of God. His death by crucifixion is prophesied in Psalm 22, a death unknown in David's time. The cry of the forsaken One is predicted in the very words which came from the lips of our Savior out of the darkness which enshrouded the cross. So also are the words of mockery by those who looked on; the piercing of his hands and feet; the parting of the garments and the casting of the lots. Finally, Psalm 110:1 prophesies that the rejected One would occupy the place at the right hand of God. It is indeed a wonderful chain of prophecies concerning Christ.

The Jewish People

When Frederick the Great, King of Prussia, asked the court chaplain for an argument that the Bible is an inspired book, he answered, "Your Majesty, the Jews." It was well said. The Scriptures are filled with predictions relating to Israel's history. Their unbelief, the rejection of the Messiah, the results of that rejection, their world-wide dispersion, the persecutions and sorrows they were to suffer, their miraculous preservation as a nation, their future great tribulation, and final restoration — all these were repeatedly announced by their own prophets. All

the epochs of their eventful history were predicted long before they were reached. Their sojourn and servitude in Egypt were announced to Abraham. The Babylonian captivity and the return of a remnant were foretold by the pre-exilic prophets, who also predicted a greater and longer exile of world-wide proportions. In the prophecies of the return from Babylon, even the name of the Persian king through whom it was to be accomplished, is foretold. Two hundred years before Cyrus was born, Isaiah prophesied of him (Isa. 44:28; 45:1).

One of the most remarkable chapters in the Pentateuch is Deuteronomy 28. Here is prewritten the sad history of Israel. The Spirit of God through Moses outlined thousands of years ago the history of the scattered nation, their suffering and tribulation, as it has been for well nigh two millenniums and as it is still. These are arguments for the divine, supernatural origin of this book, which no infidel has ever been able to answer; nor will there be found an answer. Of much interest is the last verse of this great prophetic chapter. When Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans in 70 A.D., all who did not die in the terrible calamity were sent to the mines of Egypt, where the slaves were kept constantly at work until they succumbed. According to Josephus, about 100,000 were made slaves, so that the market was glutted with them. Thus was fulfilled the word, "No man shall buy you."

Though without a land, Israel through the centuries was still a nation. All this is written beforehand in the Bible. Compare Leviticus 26:33; Deuteronomy 4:27; 28:64-67; and Jeremiah 30:11. Herder called the Jews "the enigma of history." What human mind could have foreseen that this peculiar people, dwelling in a special land, was to be scattered among the nations, suffer there as no other nation ever suffered, and yet be kept and thus marked out still as the covenant people of the God whose gifts and callings are without repentance? Here indeed is an argument for the Word of God which no infidel can answer.

According to Hosea 5:15 the Lord is to be in the midst of Israel and is to return to his place. Reference is to the manifestation of the Lord Jesus Christ among his people. They rejected him; he returned to his place in glory. They are yet to acknowledge their offence. Elsewhere in the Word predictions are

found that foretell the future national repentance of Israel when the remnant confesses their guilt in rejecting Messiah.

Prophecies of Other Nations

The prophets have much to say about the nations that touched Israel. Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, Ammon, Moab, Tyre, Sidon, Idumea and others are mentioned in the prophetic Scriptures. Their ultimate fate was predicted by God long before their downfall and overthrow occurred. Ezekiel's precise prophecies of the judgment of these nations in chapters 25 to 37 have been fulfilled to the letter, as comparison with secular history will verify. Whether it be Ezekiel's prediction of the doom of Tyre (chapters 26 to 28) or Isaiah's prophecies of the judgment of Egypt (chapter 19), all was literally fulfilled.

Moreover, the Book of Daniel supplies some of the most startling evidences of fulfilled prophecy. No book of the Bible has been more attacked than this, but it has survived all attacks. The dream of Nebuchadnezzar is recorded in the second chapter. The heathen king was informed by God of the course of world rule from his day till the kingdom of Messiah. As foretold, the kingdoms have been four: Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The final division into ten kingdoms will yet be fulfilled. In the seventh chapter the vision of Daniel covers the same ground from God's viewpoint and with added detail concerning the fourth empire. History bears witness that these four powers came onto the stage of history and fell, just as indicated in these prophetic portions. In the eighth chapter the coming and career of Alexander the Great were revealed. The identification of the wicked ruler of 8:19-24 with Antiochus Epiphanes is without refutation. The greatest prophecy in the Book of Daniel is in the ninth chapter. Here the very time of Messiah's coming, his violent death, the rebuilding of Jerusalem in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and its subsequent destruction by the Romans in 70 A.D., are clearly predicted.

The greater part of the eleventh chapter of Daniel has been historically fulfilled. So accurately have these predictions been fulfilled, that the enemies of the Word have resorted to the subterfuge that the chapter was written after the events occurred.

Several prophecies and their fulfillments will be adduced; others equally clear could be set forth. The mighty king of verse 3 was Alexander the Great, son of Philip of Macedon. Verse 4 accurately states the disruption of the Alexandrian empire. The king of the south and the king of the north of verse 6 are Ptolemy II (Philadelphus) and Antiochus II (Theos), respectively. The invasion of the land of Palestine by Antiochus the Great is foretold in verse 16. The daughter of women of verse 17 has been historically verified in Cleopatra. Verses 21-45 found their fulfillment in the wicked deeds of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes). The heroic and godly deeds of the Maccabees (recounted in the apocryphal Books of Maccabees) are referred to in verses 32 to 34.

Other Fulfilled Prophecies

The New Testament contains prophecies which are now in process of fulfillment. The present apostasy from the historic faith is predicted in such passages as I Timothy 4:1, 2; II Timothy 3:1-5; 4:1-3; II Peter 2; the Epistle of Jude; and other portions in the Epistles and the Revelation.

Unfulfilled Prophecy

There are many unfulfilled prophecies in the Bible. The literal fulfillment of prophecies in the past vouches for the literal fulfillment of every prophecy in the Word of God. The world still waits for their accomplishment. In God's time he will bring about his eternal purposes. May we, the people of God, not neglect prophecy, for the prophetic testimony is the lamp which shines in a dark place.

20

Life in the Word

By Philip Mauro

Attorney at Law, New York City

Revised and edited by Rev. Glenn O'Neal, Ph.D.

Of the many statements which the Bible makes concerning the Word of God, none is more significant, and surely none is of greater importance to dying men than the statement that the Word of God is a LIVING Word. If men are able to apprehend, however feebly, this tremendous fact, it will cause them to give it the proper respect and the utmost emphasis in their preaching and teaching.

In Philippians 2:16 we have the expression, "The Word of Life." The same expression occurs in I John 1:1. It is here used of Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Word, whereas in Philippians it is apparently the Written Word that is spoken of. The Written Word and the Incarnate Word are so identified in Scripture that it is not always clear which is meant. The same things are said of each, and the same characters attributed to each. The fundamental resemblance lies in the fact that each is the revealer or tangible expression of the Invisible God. As the written or spoken word expresses, for the purpose of communicating to another, the invisible and inaccessible thought, so Jesus Christ as the Incarnate Word, and the Holy Scriptures as the written Word, express and communicate knowledge of the invisible and inaccessible God. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me" (John 14:9, 11).

In Hebrews 4:12 we find the statement that "The Word of God is LIVING and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword" (ASV). Clearly this refers to the written Word. But the very next verse, without any change of subject, directs our attention to the Searcher of hearts (Rev. 2:23), saying, "Neither is there any

creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do."

Again in I Peter 1:23 we read of "the Word of God which liveth," or more literally, "the Word of God living." Here again there might be uncertainty as to whether the Incarnate Word or the Written Word be meant; but it is generally understood that the latter is in view, and the quotation from Isaiah 40:6-8 would confirm this idea.

From these passages we learn that the Word of God is spoken of as a "living" Word. This is a very remarkable statement, and is worthy of our closest examination and most earnest consideration. Why is the Word of God thus spoken of? Why is the extraordinary property of LIFE, or vitality, attributed to it? In what respects can it be said to be a living Word?

But the expression "living," as applied to the Word of God, manifestly means something more than partaking of the kind of life with which we are acquainted from observation. God speaks of himself as the "Living God." The Lord Jesus is the "Prince of Life" (Acts 3:15). He announced himself to John in the vision of Patmos as "he that liveth." Eternal life is in him (I John 5:11).

It is clear, then, that when we read, "The Word of God is living," we are to understand thereby that it lives with a spiritual, an inexhaustible, an inextinguishable, in a word, a divine, life. If the Word of God be indeed living in this sense, then we have here a fact of the most tremendous significance. In the world around us the beings and things which we call "living" may just as appropriately be spoken of as "dying." What we call "the land of the living" might better be described as the land of the dying. Wherever we look we see that death is in possession, and is working according to its invariable method of corruption and decay. Death is the real monarch of this world, and we meet at every turn the gruesome evidence and results of the universal sway of him who has "the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14). "Death reigned" (Rom. 5:17), and still reigns over everything. The mighty and awful power of death has made this earth of ours a great burying ground — a gigantic cemetery.

Can it be that there is an exception to this apparently universal rule? Is there, indeed, in this world of dying beings, where the forces of corruption fasten immediately upon everything into which life has entered, and upon all the works of so-called living creatures, one object which is really LIVING, an object upon which corruption cannot fasten itself, and which resists and defies all the power of death? Such is the assertion of the passages of Scripture which we have quoted. Surely, then, if these statements be true, we have here the most astonishing phenomenon in all the accessible universe; and it will be well worth while to investigate an object of which so startling an assertion is seriously, if very unobtrusively, made.

Before we proceed with our inquiry let us note one of many points of resemblance between the Incarnate Word and the Written Word. When "the Word was made flesh and dwelt (tabernacled) among us" (John 1:14), there was nothing in his appearance to manifest his deity, or to show that "in him was life" (John 1:4). That fact was demonstrated not by his blameless and unselfish behavior, nor by his incomparable teachings and discourses, but by his *resurrection from the dead*. The only power which is greater than that of death is the power of life. He had, and exercised, that power, and holds now the keys of death and of Hades (Rev. 1:18, ASV).

Similarly, there is nothing in the appearance and behavior (so to speak) of the Bible to show that it has a characteristic, even divine life, which other books have not. It bears the same resemblance to other writings that Jesus, the Son of Mary, bore to other men. It is given in human language just as he came in human flesh. Yet there is between it and all other books the same difference as between him and all other men, namely, the difference *between the living and the dying*. "The word of God is living."

It will require, therefore, something more than a hasty glance or a casual inspection to discern this wonderful difference; but the difference is there, and with diligence and attention we may discover some clear indications of it.

We look then at the Written Word of God to see if it manifests characteristics which are found only in living things, and to see if it exhibits, not merely the possession of life of the perishable

and corruptible sort with which we are so familiar by observation, but life of a different order, imperishable and incorruptible.

I. PERENNIAL FRESHNESS

The Bible differs radically from all other books in its perpetual freshness. This characteristic will be recognized only by those who know the Book in that intimate way which comes from living with it, as with a member of one's family. I mention it first because it was one of the first *unique* properties of the Bible which impressed me after I began to read it as a believer in Christ. It is a very remarkable fact that the Bible never becomes exhausted, never acquires sameness, never diminishes in its power of responsiveness to the quickened soul who comes to it. The most familiar passages yield as much (if not more) refreshment at the thousandth perusal, as at the first. It is indeed as a fountain of living water. The fountain is the same, but the water is always fresh, and always refreshing. We can compare this to nothing but what we find in a living companion, whom we love and to whom we go for help and fellowship. The person is always the same, and yet without sameness. New conditions evoke new responses; and so it is with the Bible. As a living Book it adapts itself to the new phases of our experience and the new conditions in which we find ourselves. From the most familiar passage there comes again and again *a new message*; just as our most familiar friend or companion will have something new to say, as changed conditions and new situations require it from time to time.

But while the Bible resembles in this important respect a living person, who is our familiar, sympathetic, and responsive companion, it differs from such a human companion in that the counsel, comfort, and support it furnishes are far above and beyond what any human being can supply; and the only explanation of this is that the source of its life and powers is not human, but divine.

II. THE BIBLE DOES NOT BECOME OBSOLETE

One of the most prominent characteristics of books written by men for the purpose of imparting information and instruction, is that they very quickly become obsolete, and must be cast aside and replaced by others. This is particularly true of books on science, textbooks and the like. Indeed, it is a matter of boasting (though

it would be hard to explain why) that "progress" is so rapid in all departments of learning as to render the scientific books of one generation almost worthless to the next. Changes in human knowledge, thought and opinion occur so swiftly, that books, which were the standards yesterday, are set aside today for others, which in turn will be discarded for yet other "authorities" tomorrow. In fact, every book which is written for a serious purpose begins to become obsolete before the ink is dry on the page. This may be made the occasion of boasting of the great progress of humanity, and of the wonderful advances of "science"; but the true significance of the fact is that man's books are all, like himself, dying creatures.

The Bible, on the other hand, although it treats of the greatest and most serious of all subjects, such as God, Christ, eternity, life, death, sin, righteousness, judgment, redemption — is always the latest, best, and *only* authority on all these and other weighty matters whereof it treats. Centuries of "progress" and "advancement" have added *absolutely nothing* to the sum of knowledge on any of these subjects. The Bible is always fresh and thoroughly "up-to-date." Indeed, it is far, far ahead of human science. Progress cannot overtake it, or go beyond it. Generation succeeds generation, but each finds the Bible waiting for it with its ever fresh and never failing stores of information touching matters of the highest concern, touching *everything* that affects the welfare of human beings.

We may say then that, considered merely as a book of instruction, the Bible is, as to every subject whereof it treats, not merely abreast of, but far ahead of the learning of these and all other times, whether past or future. The impressions it makes upon believing minds are the impressions of *truth*, even though contemporary science may give, as its settled conclusions, impressions directly to the contrary.

Unlike other books of instruction, *the Bible does not become obsolete.* This is a fact of immense significance; and its only explanation is that the Bible is a LIVING book, the Word of the living God. All other books partake of the infirmity of their authors, and are either dying or dead.

III. THE BIBLE IS INDESTRUCTIBLE

The Bible manifests the possession of inherent and imperishable life in that it survives all the attempts that have been made to destroy it.

The Bible is the only book in the world that is truly hated. The hatred it arouses is bitter, persistent, murderous. From generation to generation this hatred has been kept alive. There is doubtless a supernatural explanation for this continuous display of hostility towards the Word of God, for that Word has a supernatural enemy who has personally experienced its power (Matt. 4:1-10).

But the natural explanation of this hatred is that the Bible differs notably from other books in that it gives no flattering picture of man and his world, but just the reverse. The Bible does not say that man is a noble being, ever aspiring towards the attainment of exalted ideals. It does not describe the career of humanity as "progress," as the brave and successful struggle of man against the evils of his environment; but quite the contrary, declares it to be a career of disobedience and departure from God, a preference for darkness rather than for light, "because their deeds are evil."

The Bible does not represent man as having come, without any fault of his own, into adverse circumstances, and as being engaged in gradually overcoming these by the development and exercise of his inherent powers. It does not applaud his achievements, and extol his wonderful civilization. On the contrary, it records how God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually (Gen. 6:5). It speaks of man as "being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, strife, guile, evil dispositions; whisperers, slanderers, hateful to God, insolent, proud, vaunting inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, perfidious, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful" (Rom. 1:29-31 Gr.). It says that "They are all under sin," that "there is none righteous, no, not one. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one" (Rom. 3:10-12). Man's con-

What a description!

dition by nature is described as "dead in trespasses and sins," "children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conduct in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath" (Eph. 2:1-3).

The Bible has nothing to say in praise of man or of his natural endowments. On the contrary, it derides his wisdom as "foolishness with God." It declares that God has made foolish the wisdom of this age (I Cor. 1:20); that the natural man is incapable of receiving the things of the Spirit of God (I Cor. 2:14); and that if any man thinks that he knows anything, he knows nothing yet as he ought to know (I Cor. 8:2).

Nor does the Bible predict the ultimate triumph of "civilization." It does not say that the progress of humanity shall bring it eventually to a vastly better state of things. It does not say that human nature shall improve under the influences of education and self-culture, even with that of Christianity added. On the contrary, it declares that evil men "shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived" (II Tim. 3:13).

Even of "this present evil age" (Gal. 1:4), during which the professing church is the most conspicuous object on earth, and during which the world has the enormous benefit resulting from the light of revelation and an open Bible, it is not predicted that man and his world would undergo any improvement, or that the developments of the age would be in the direction of better conditions on earth. On the contrary, the Bible declares that "in the last days perilous (or difficult) times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, lovers of money, vaunting, proud, evil speakers, disobedient to parents, untruthful, unholy, without natural affection, implacable, slanderers, inconsistent, savage, not lovers of good, betrayers, headstrong, puffed up, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God; having a form of piety, but denying the power of it" (II Tim. 3:1-5 Gr.),

Such is the character of man, and such is to be the result as Scripture foretells it, of all his schemes of betterment, education, development, self-culture, civilization and character-building. And because of this the Bible is heartily detested. Men have sought

Heart of man the same

nothing more earnestly than they have sought to destroy this appallingly accurate portrait of themselves and their doings. How astonishing it is that any intelligent person should suppose that man drew this picture of himself, and predicted this as the outcome of all his own efforts! No wonder the Bible is hated, and for the simple and sufficient reason that it declares the truth about man and his world. The Lord Jesus set forth clearly both the fact and its explanation when he said to his unbelieving brethren, "The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it that the works thereof are evil" (John 7:7).

Again, the Bible is hated because it claims the right to exercise, and assumes to exercise, authority over man. It speaks as one having authority. It issues commands to all. It says, "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not." It does not simply advise or commend one course of action rather than another, as one would address an equal, but it directs men imperatively what they shall do, and what they shall not do. In this manner it addresses all ranks and conditions of men — kings and governors, parents and children, husbands and wives, masters and servants, rich and poor, high and low, free and bond. In this, too, we have a characteristic of the Bible which distinguishes it from all other books. It is no respecter of persons. But for this cause also it is hated; for men are becoming more and more impatient of all external authority. The principles of democracy, the essence of which is the supremacy (virtually the divinity) of man, leave thoroughly leavened all society in the progressive nations of the earth. There is a sentiment abroad, which finds frequent expression and meets always with a sympathetic reception, to the effect that man has been shackled through the ages by narrow theological ideas whereof the Bible is the source, and that the time has arrived for him to throw off this bondage, to arise in his true might and majesty, and to do great things for himself.

It is a most impressive fact that, in all the visible universe, there is nothing that assumes authority over man, or that imposes laws upon him, except the Bible. Once thoroughly rid of that troublesome book, and man will be finally rid of all authority, and will have arrived at that state of lawlessness predicted in the New Testament prophecies, wherein society will be ready to accept the leader-

ship of that "lawless one," whose coming is to be after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and wonders of falsehood, and with all deceit of unrighteousness in them that perish because they received not a love of the truth that they might be saved (II Thess. 2:7-10). *Are n't we there!*

This is perhaps the main purpose of the persistent attempts in our day, mostly in the name of scholarship and liberal theology, to break down the authority of Scripture; and we may see with our own eyes that the measure of success of this great apostasy is just what the Bible has foretold.

Other books arouse no hatred. There may be books which men dislike, and such they simply let alone. But the Bible is, and always has been, hated to the death. It is the one book that has been pursued from century to century, as men pursue a mortal foe. At first its destruction has been sought by violence. All human powers, political and ecclesiastical, have combined to put it out of existence. Death has been the penalty for possessing or reading a copy; and such copies as were found have been turned over to the public executioner to be treated as was the Incarnate Word. No expedient that human ingenuity could devise or human cruelty put into effect, has been omitted in the desperate attempt to put this detested book out of existence.

But, violence having failed to rid man of the Bible other means have been resorted to in the persistent effort to accomplish that object. To this end the intellect and learning of man have been enlisted. The Book has been assailed from every side by men of the highest intelligence, culture and scholarship. Since the art of printing has been developed, there has been in progress a continuous war of books. Many books against *the Book* — man's books against God's Book. Its authority has been denied, and its veracity and even its morality have been impugned, its claims upon the consciences of men have been ridiculed; but all to no purpose, except to bring out more conspicuously the fact that the "Word of God is LIVING," and with an indestructible life.

A little less than two centuries ago a book made its appearance which attracted wide attention, particularly in the upper circles of intellect and culture. It was vauntingly entitled the "Age of

Reason," and its author, Thomas Paine, was probably without superior in intelligence among his contemporaries. So confident was the author of this book that his reasonings proved the untrustworthiness of Scripture, and destroyed its claim upon the consciences of men as the revelation of the living God, that he predicted that in fifty years the Bible would be practically out of print. But nearly two hundred years have passed since this boast was uttered. The boaster and his book have passed away; and their very names are well-nigh forgotten. But the Word of God has maintained its place, and not by human power. They who believe and cherish it are a feeble folk. Not many wise, not many mighty, not many high-born are among them. They have no might of their own to stand against the enemies of the Bible. The situation resembles a scene recorded in I Kings 20:27, where the Israelites went out against the Syrians, and we read that "The children of Israel pitched before them like two little flocks of kids; but the Syrians filled the country." But notwithstanding such great odds, the victory is certain. The enemies of the Bible have indeed filled the country. Yet, they shall all pass away; but the Word of the Lord shall not pass away.

IV. THE BIBLE IS A DISCERNER OF HEARTS

The power of discernment belongs only to an intelligent living being; and the power of discernment possessed by man does not go beneath the surface of things. Yet the passage in Hebrews, already quoted (4:12), asserts that Word of God is a "discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

This is a very remarkable statement, yet it is true and millions of men have felt and recognized the searching and discerning power of the Word of God. We go to it not so much to learn the thoughts of other men, as to learn our own thoughts. We go to other books to find what was in the hearts and minds of their authors; but we go to this Book to find what is in our hearts and minds. To one who reads it with ever so little spiritual intelligence, there comes a perception of the fact that this Book understands and knows all about him. It lays bare the deepest secrets of his heart, and brings to the surface of his consciousness, out of the unfathomable depths and unexplorable

recesses of his own being, "thoughts and intents" whose existence was unsuspected. It reveals man to himself in a way difficult to describe, and absolutely peculiar to itself. It is a faithful mirror which reflects us exactly as we are. It detects our motives, discerns our needs; uncovers our repressions and having truthfully revealed to us our true selves, it counsels, reproves, exhorts, guides, refreshes, strengthens, and illuminates.

The living Word shall continue to be the discerning companion of all who resort to it for the help which is not to be had elsewhere in this world of the dying. In going to the Bible we never think of ourselves as going *back* to a book of the distant past, to a thing of *antiquity*; but we go to it as to a book of the *present*—a living book.

V. THE WORD EXHIBITS THE CHARACTERISTICS OF GROWTH

Growth is one of the characteristics of a living being. The Word of God lodges and grows in human hearts, for there is its real lodgment, rather than in the printed page. The Psalmist says, "Thy Word have I hid in my heart" (Ps. 119:11).

The Book of Deuteronomy has much to say about the Word of God. In chapter 30 it declares (verse 14) that "The Word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart." This is repeated in Romans 10:8, with the addition, "that is, the word of faith which we preach."

In I Thessalonians 2:13 Paul says to the Thessalonians, "When ye received the Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the Word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." The believing heart is its lodgment, and there it works to effect some definite results.

In Colossians 3:16 we have the admonition, "Let the word of Christ dwell *in* you richly in all wisdom." It is in the believing heart that the Word dwells richly.

The Lord Jesus, in explaining the parable of the sower, said "The seed is the Word of God" (Luke 8:11); and again, "The sower soweth *the Word*" (Mark 4:14). (A seed, of course, is worthless except it have life in it.) And he further explained that the seed

which fell on good ground "are they which, *in an honest and good heart*, having heard the Word keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience" (Luke 8:15). To the unbelieving Jews the Lord said, "And ye have not his Word *abiding in you*; for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not" (John 5:38).

In Colossians 1:5, 6, Paul speaks of the "Word of the truth of the Gospel, which is come unto you, as it is in all the world, and bringeth forth fruit."

In these passages we have presented to us the thought of the Word as a living seed or germ, first finding lodgment in the heart of man, and then abiding and growing there.

The growth of the Word of God is specifically mentioned in several striking passages in the Acts of the Apostles. Acts 6:7: "And the Word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly." Here we are told specifically that the Word of God increased. We learn from this that the mere multiplication of copies of the Scriptures is in itself of no importance. It is of no avail to have the Book in the house, and on the shelf or table, if it be not taken into the heart. But when so received into the heart, the Word of God grows and increases. It is assimilated into the life of him who receives it, and henceforth is a part of himself.

Happy is the man who has "received the Word of God" (Acts 8:14; 11:1, etc.), who has made room for it in his life, and in whose heart and mind it has grown and prevailed.

VI. A LIFE-GIVING WORD

We come now to something higher and deeper. The great mystery of a living thing is the power it possesses of propagating its kind.

The fact of spiritual conception, and the nature of the seed whereby it is effected, are plainly declared in I Peter 1:23: "Being born (or having been begotten) again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by THE WORD OF GOD WHICH LIVETH and abideth for ever."

There is an immense amount of truth of the highest importance contained in this passage; but the statement which especially con-

cerns us is that the seed of the new birth is from the living Word ("the Word which LIVETH"). This statement plainly teaches that the Word of God possesses the highest endowment of a living being, namely, that of imparting life. And with this agrees the teaching of the Lord Jesus in the parable of the sower, in the explanation of which he said, "The *seed* is the Word of God" (Luke 8:11).

In consequence of the transgression and fall of the first man, who was the original depository of the life of humanity (Gen. 2:7), the life in him, being "corruptible," became vitiated. Hence, by inexorable law, the seed of his generations also became corrupted. It follows that all men in their natural generation are begotten of corruptible (and corrupted) seed; and have received (and hence must impart to their succeeding generations) a corrupted life. What, therefore, was needed, in order to bring into existence a human family answering to God's purpose in the creation of man (Gen. 1:26), was a new and *incorruptible seed*. This has been supplied in the Word of God. All who believe that Word are begotten again (or from above); not this time of corruptible seed, "but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth." It is a living Word.

It is to be noted that this Scripture testifies that the seed of the living Word is not merely uncorrupted, but is "incorruptible." It partakes, therefore, of the nature of the "uncorruptible God" (Rom. 1:23).

This is the guaranty to us that the Word of God is not subject to the corrupting influences of the corrupted and decaying world into which it is come. It is the *only thing* which has not succumbed to the forces of decay and death which reign universally in the earth. Indeed, it has not been affected in the slightest degree by those forces. This has been pointed out at length in the foregoing pages; but the grand truth comes to us with peculiar force in connection with the passage in I Peter. We need not be at all concerned as to whether the truth of God, embodied by him in his Word, has been corrupted, for it is incorruptible. And by that Word they who believe are begotten again through the operation of the Holy Spirit. To them "the Spirit is life" (Rom. 8:10).

The same truth is declared in James 1:18, in the words, "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth."

Such is the spiritual conception of the "sons of God." These are born, or begotten. In no other way is a "son" brought into existence save by being begotten of a father. The sons of God must be begotten of God. The Apostle John tells us that they are begotten, "not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man" (John 1:13). The Apostle James tells us that "of his own will" they are begotten. Therefore, though the process be inscrutably mysterious, there can be no doubt as to the fact. When the Word of God is truly "heard" and thereby received into a prepared heart, that word becomes truly a seed, spiritual and incorruptible in nature, which, when quickened by the Spirit of God, becomes the life-germ of a new creature—a son of God.

The same truth is very clearly taught in our Lord's explanation of his parable of the sower, to which reference has already been made. Inasmuch as we have his own interpretation of this parable, we need be in no uncertainty as to its meaning. He says, "Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the Devil and taketh away *the Word out of their hearts*, lest they should *believe* and be saved" (Luke 8:12). And again: "But that on the good ground are they which, in *an honest and good heart*, having heard the Word keep it and bring forth fruit with patience" (Luke 8:15).

The method of spiritual conception set forth in these Scriptures, which is effected in a manner quite analogous to natural conception, furnishes the explanation of the connection between "believing" and "life" referred to in many passages of Scripture. One of the most familiar of these is John 5:24 where the Lord Jesus states in the simplest language that the man who hears his Word and believes on him who sent him has everlasting life, and is passed out of death into life. Such a man receives the seed in his heart, and the seed is there quickened into life.

Indeed, the great purpose of the Written Word is to impart life—even eternal (that is to say divine) life — to those who are dead through trespasses and sins. The Gospel of John, which is devoted largely to the great subject of eternal life, and from which

a large part of our information concerning it is derived, was "written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and that *believing* ye might have *life* through his name" (John 20:31).

The same truth is declared in the familiar passage in Romans 10:9, which sets forth very definitely the special truth which constitutes the substance and marrow of God's revelation in his Word, and which he calls upon men to believe and obey through the preaching of the Gospel, namely that Jesus Christ, who died for sinners, has been *raised from the dead*, and that he is Lord of all, to the glory of God the Father.

The main point to be apprehended in this connection is that a certain state of preparedness of heart is necessary in order that the "good seed" of the Word may germinate and grow there. Such a prepared heart is described in Scripture as a *believing* heart. That prepared state is manifested when a man *believes God*, as Abraham did (Rom. 4:17); or, in other words, when a man is ready to receive the Word of God *as* the Word of God, as the Thessalonians did (I Thess. 2:13). When a man has been brought, by the operation of the Spirit of God, who is the "Spirit of LIFE in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:2, 10), into this state of preparation, then the Word of God, being received into the heart, acts as a seed falling into good soil.

Such is the power of the *living* truth to impart life; and herein lies the difference between the truth which God has revealed in his Word, and truth which may be found elsewhere. For there is much truth which is not *living* truth. The multiplication table is truth; but it is not living truth. It has no quickening power. The theorems of geometry are truth; but they are not living truth. Never yet has any man been heard to testify that he had been the wretched and hopeless slave of sin, and had continued in spiritual darkness, fast bound in misery and vice until his eyes were opened by the great truth that two and two make four, or that three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles; and that thereby his life had been transformed, his soul delivered from bondage, and his heart filled with joy and peace in believing. On the other hand, in the case of a true conversion, it may have been but the shortest and simplest statement of "the Word of the truth of the Gospel"

(Col. 1:5) that was heard and believed, such as that "Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. 5:6), yet it suffices, through the mighty power of him who raised up Christ from among the dead, to quicken together with Christ a soul that previously was dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. 1:20; 2:5). Thus the Word of truth becomes, in some inscrutable way, the vehicle for imparting that life of which the risen Christ, the Incarnate Word, is the only Source. Eternal life for the individual soul begins through believing "the testimony of God" (I Cor. 1:2), and the testimony of God which he has in grace given to perishing sinners that they may believe and be saved, is "concerning his Son" (Rom. 1:3; I John 5:10). "And this is the record (or testimony), that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son" (I John 5:11). Therefore, it is written of those who experienced the new birth, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:26).

VII. THE LIFE-SUSTAINING WORD

The life possessed by human beings is not only a derived life, that is, a life obtained from an external source, but it is a dependent life, requiring continual sustenance. It must be sustained by constant and suitable nutrition, received into the body at short intervals. Man's strength whereof he boasts, and indeed his very existence in the body, are dependent on food, and this food itself must be organic matter, that is to say, matter which has once been living. The fact of this dependence upon food, and upon food which man is utterly unable to make for himself out of inorganic matter, though all the materials are within his reach, should teach him a lesson in humility; but it seems not to have that effect.

Men boast in these days of their "independence," and make much of "self-reliance." But this is the height of presumptuous folly; for man is a most helplessly dependent creature, not even able like the plant, to prepare his own food from the mineral elements, but dependent daily upon living creatures much lower than himself in the scale of being. And so far from having a basis for self-reliance, he does not know how to conduct the simplest of the vital processes of his own body. If his Creator, of whom principally man loves to fancy himself independent, should turn over to him the operation of the least of those essential processes for the briefest time, the poor creature would miserably perish.

As with the physical life, so is it with the spiritual life of those who have been begotten again of the incorruptible seed of the Word. These spiritual beings require appropriate food; and God has abundantly provided for this need. In studying the important subject of spiritual nutrition we shall learn again the relation between Christ, the Incarnate Word, and the Written Word. Both are spoken of repeatedly as food for the children of God.

The third, fourth and fifth chapters of the Gospel of John treat of the imparting of eternal life as the free gift of God through Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to all who believe on him; and the sixth chapter treats of spiritual nutrition. Therein, after feeding the multitude miraculously, thus showing himself as the one by whose power food is multiplied in the earth, he reveals himself as "the Bread of Life." Twice he says, "I am that bread of life" (verses 35 and 48) and in verse 33, "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." He who gives the life is the One who also sustains it. Again he says, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven" (verse 51). And of his words he says, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life" (verse 63).

These sayings to the natural mind are, of course, meaningless; but they are addressed to faith. "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" is the question which the unbelieving heart asks. How Christ can impart himself to sustain the "inner man" is a question to which no answer can now be had. The process of physical nutrition is equally beyond human comprehension and contrary to all *a priori* probabilities.

Looking more particularly at what is said in this connection concerning the written or spoken Word of God, we find that the Word of God is "living" in the sense that, like other living substance, it has the property of furnishing nutrition, and thereby sustaining life. It is a life-sustaining Word. But here a notable difference attracts our attention. Physical food comes up out of the earth (Ps. 104:14), while spiritual food comes down out of heaven. (John 6:50.)

Reference has already been made to the fact that, after setting forth the great truth of spiritual conception and generation through

the incorruptible seed of the Word of God, the Apostle Peter enjoins attention to spiritual nutrition. "Wherefore," he says, "as newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby" (I Peter 2:1, 2). Evidently his Lord's three-fold injunction, "Feed my sheep," "Feed my lambs," had impressed upon him the importance of spiritual nutrition. But proper feeding requires appetite for wholesome food, and so he seeks to excite a desire in young Christians for that whereby they may grow. And he immediately connects the Word with Christ saying, "If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious."

The importance of nourishing and sustaining the new life received upon coming to Christ, and the unhappy consequences which always result from neglect of the appropriate diet, have been so often and so forcibly stated by the servants of Christ, that it seems hardly necessary to dwell upon this matter. What our subject specially calls for is to note the correspondence between God's way of sustaining man's physical life by food derived from a living source, and his way of sustaining the believer's spiritual life by food from a living source, that is to say from the living Word.

The passages which present the Word of God as the food for his children are very familiar; and in bringing them to mind again we would impress it upon our readers that these statements are not to be taken as if they were poetical or figurative, but as very literal, practical and immensely important. In making man it was not God's plan that he should live by bread, or physical food alone, but "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord" (Deut. 8:3). The manna was given to his people in the wilderness to teach them this lesson, and that they might learn their dependence upon God. Hence, this passage was used by the Second Man in his combat with the devil in the wilderness, it being the purpose of the latter to inculcate in man the idea of independence of God. Thus did the Man Jesus Christ, with the Sword of the Spirit, strike sure and true at the central purpose of his great adversary.

It is by *every* word of God that man is to be fed. No part of the Bible can be neglected without loss and detriment; and it will be observed that there is, in the Bible, a variety of spiritual nutriment

analogous to the variety of physical food which God has provided for the needs of the physical man. If there be milk for babes, there is also strong food for those who are mature. And there is the penalty of arrested growth paid by those who remain content with the relatively weak diet suitable for infants who know, perhaps, only that their sins are forgiven; as the Apostle John says: "I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you" (I John 2:12). But those who have to be fed on a milk diet, that is to say, the simplest elementary truths of the Gospel, are unskillful in the word of righteousness. Infants cannot do anything for themselves, much less can they prepare food, or render any service to others. Hence, the Apostle Paul, writing to the Hebrews, upbraids some of them because, at a time when they ought to have been teachers, they had need to be taught again the first principles, and were become "such as have need of milk and not of strong food. For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong food belongeth to them that are of full age" (Heb. 5:12-14).

Jeremiah says, "Thy words were found and I did eat them" (Jer. 15:16). Thereby he found spiritual strength to sustain him in his most difficult and trying ministry, from which, because of his timid and sensitive disposition, he shrank back in agony of soul. To be a good and effective minister of Christ it is necessary that one be well nourished through partaking largely of the abundant spiritual food which the living Word supplies. Thus Paul admonished his child in the faith, Timothy, to whom he wrote, "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, *nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine*" (I Tim. 4:6).

VIII. THE LIFE-TRANSFORMING WORD

Feeding upon the Word of God, the bread of life, must necessarily be beneficial to the whole man, including his intellectual and physical being as well as his spiritual. The new man requires a new mind and provision is made to that end. Paul said, "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind" (Eph. 4:23), and, "Be not conformed to this world (or age), but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind" (Rom. 12:2). The old mind, with all its

habits of self-occupation (a sure breeder of unhappiness and discontent), its morbid tendencies, its craving for excitement and sensation, its imaginations, appetites, tastes, inclinations and desires, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, is to be displaced and a new mind substituted; for godliness has the promise of the vigor of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come.

How, then is this injunction to be carried out? It is of importance to millions of anxious souls to have a clear answer to this question. And it may be had. The everyday incidents and the atmosphere amid which the average man and woman spend their time, are such as to produce mental disturbances and disorders to an extent which, if understood, and if anything could impress this thoughtless and excited age, would create widespread alarm. The frequency with which one encounters cases of mental depression, insomnia, melancholia, and other nervous disorders, tells of widespread and insidious foes which attack the seat of reason, and which call for methods and means of defense and repair which are beyond the resources of medicine.

The writer knows by experience the indescribable horrors of depressed and morbid mental states, and knows, too, what a transformation is effected by the "renewing of the mind" according to the Biblical injunction. Full provision is made for this marvelous transformation, and the conditions wherein it is effected are plainly set forth and are accessible to every believer. In this case the study of the word used in the command ("be transformed") will make us acquainted with the conditions essential to the transformation. The word in question seems to have been set apart by the Holy Spirit for the purpose of teaching the important and wonderful secret of the transformation of the believer, during his existence in the body, into the likeness of Christ; so that all believers might be able to say with Paul, "We have the mind of Christ."

It will, therefore, surely repay the reader to note carefully the usages of this particular word. Its first occurrence is in the Gospel narratives of the Transfiguration of Jesus Christ, and is in fact the very word there translated "transfigured" (Matt. 17:2; Mark 9:2). The word is literally "metamorphosed." "His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." This

may well serve to teach the nature of the change contemplated. It is one that brings the radiance of heaven into the mind and tinges even the commonplace things with a glow of heavenly light.

The next occurrence of the word is, as we have already seen, in Romans 12:2, where believers are enjoined to be not cut out on the pattern of this age, but to be metamorphosed or transfigured by the renewing of their minds.

The third and last occurrence of the word tells us plainly *how* this great transformation is brought about. For the Bible is a very practical book. It comes moreover, from One who understands perfectly the limitations of man, who knows and declares that the latter is, in his natural state, "without strength," that is to say utterly impotent (Rom. 5:6). We may be sure, therefore, that when God calls upon the quickened soul to do a thing, he puts the means required for it within his reach. And so, in these plain words we read the conditions requisite for effecting the desired transformation: "We all, with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, *are changed* into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord" (II Cor. 3:18).

The word here translated "are changed" is the same word (metamorphosed or transfigured) used in the other passages cited; and these are the only occurrences of that word in the Bible.

The teaching is very clear. When the Jews read the Word of God a veil is over their hearts, their minds being blinded (verse 14). Or, as stated in Romans 11:25, "blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in." Hence, they do not behold there him of whom the Scriptures testify. But, for us who believe the veil is done away in Christ, and consequently, all we beholding are transfigured into the same image by the divine and irresistible operation of the Holy Spirit.

If, when we look into the Word of God, *we do not see Christ there*, we look to no purpose, for he is everywhere in the Book.

Let it be carefully noted that this transformation is not the work of the man who beholds Christ in the Word; for the process is carried on while the former is not occupied with himself at all, or with his transformation, but is absorbed in the contemplation of

the glory of the Lord. The transformation is effected by the power of the Spirit of God; and we may learn from this passage the important lesson that occupation with, and concern about, the work of the Spirit in us can only hinder that work. Let it suffice us that he who has begun a good work *in us* will perform it until the day of Christ. (Phil. 1:6.) Our part, and it should be also our delight, is to be continually beholding or contemplating the glory of the Lord; and while so doing we "*are changed*" into the same image, and all the faster if we are unconscious of ourselves.

Let it be also noted that the transformation is a gradual operation, calling for steadfastness in contemplating the One who is the object placed before us by the Holy Spirit. Little by little, as our gaze is fixed upon him, the old traits and dispositions which are unlike him are replaced by his own characteristics. Thus the work proceeds "from glory to glory." The conformation to his image, which is God's purpose for all the sons of God (Rom. 8:29), is not accomplished, as some would have it, by an instantaneous transfiguration, a convulsive upheaval and displacement of the old nature, brought about by working one's emotions into an ecstatic state; but is accomplished gradually while the believer is continually occupied with Christ ("beholding"). There is no hysterical short-cut to the desired result. For Christ must be known from the Written Word by the application of the Holy Spirit; and the process should continue during the whole term of the believer's existence in the body.

Thus the living Word becomes the regulator and transformer of the minds of those who diligently seek it. Under its potent influence confusion of thought, perplexities, depressed mental states, and other hurtful conditions are dissipated, and the serene tranquillity and repose of the mind of Christ are reproduced in those who are redeemed by his precious blood.

We are passing through the domain of death, the country of the last enemy that is to be destroyed, and who has put all things in this scene under his feet (I Cor. 15:26, 27). On every hand our eyes meet the unmistakable evidences of the supreme sovereignty of death. But in this domain of death there is a Living Word — a Living Word in a dying world. The forces of corrup-

tion and decay cannot fasten upon it, and it laughs at the attacks of its enemies.

But that Word is here, not merely to manifest life, but rather to impart life to those who are perishing, and to bring them into vital contact with the new Life-Source of humanity, the Son of God, the Second Man, the Lord from heaven, who liveth and was dead, and behold he is alive forevermore, and has the keys of death and of Hades (I Cor. 15:47; Rev. 1:18). He, as man, has crossed the gulf between the realm of death and that of life. To that end he became "a partaker of flesh and blood," not to improve flesh and blood, but in order that "through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. 2:14, 15). Having himself crossed that gulf he is the way of life to all who believe on him, who, having heard his Word — the Word of life — have likewise passed out of death into life (John 5:24).

This is the wonderful provision of God for the deliverance of dying men. In order that they might not die, and because God wills not that any should perish (II Peter 3:9), he has sent into this dying world a Word of Life. For God is not the God of the dead, but of the living (Matt. 22:32).

In comparison with the provision of divine wisdom, power and grace, from the God who quickeneth the dead (Rom. 4:17), how pitifully foolish and vain are all human schemes for the betterment, reform and cultivation of that old man who has fallen under the sovereignty of death! Men are very ingenious, but none has yet brought forward a scheme for abolishing or escaping death, or for raising the dead. Without that, of what avail are plans of improvement? And what end do they serve but to blind men's minds to the truth that they are dead, and so are beyond all but the power of a God who raises the dead? Surely these schemes are the most successful devices of "the god of this age."

What men need is not morality, but life; not to make death respectable, but to receive the gift of eternal life; not decent interment, but a pathway out of the realm of death. Many men have brought forward their schemes for the "uplift of humanity" (though the results thereof are not yet discernible); but there is

only One man who makes, or ever made, the offer of eternal life. None other has ever said, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me though he were dead yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die" (John 11 :25, 26). He only claims to be the "Fountain of Living Waters" (Jer. 2:13; John 4:14; 7:37), and says to all who are suffering the thirst of death, "Come unto me and drink" (John 7:37).

Therefore, in concluding these reflections upon the Living Word, we obey the command, "Let him that heareth say, Come," and would lovingly repeat the last invitation of grace recorded in the Word of Life: "Let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev. 22:17).

21

Is There a God?

By Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, M.A., D.D.

Kilmarnock, Scotland

Abridged and emended by James H. Christian, Th.D.

Whether or not there is a supreme personal intelligence, infinite and eternal, omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent, the Creator, upholder and ruler of the universe, immanent in and yet transcending all things, gracious and merciful, the Father and Redeemer of mankind, is surely the profoundest problem that can agitate the human mind. Lying as it does at the foundation of all man's religious beliefs — as to responsibility and duty, sin and salvation, immortality and future blessedness, as to the possibility of a revelation, of an incarnation, of a resurrection, as to the value of prayer, the credibility of miracle, the reality of providence — with the reply given to it are bound up not alone the temporal and eternal happiness of the individual, but also the welfare and progress of the race. Nevertheless, to it have been returned the most varied responses.

The atheist, for example, asserts that there is no God. The agnostic professes that he cannot tell whether there is a God or not. The materialist boasts that he does not need a God, that he can run the universe without one. The Christian answers that he cannot do without a God.

I. THE ANSWER OF THE ATHEIST

"There Is No God"

In these days it will hardly do to pass by this bold and confident negation by simply saying that the theoretical atheist is an altogether exceptional specimen of humanity, and that his audacious utterance is as much the outcome of ignorance as of impiety. It is apparent that theoretical atheism is not extinct, even in cultured

circles, and that some observations with regard to it are needed. Let these observations be the following:

1. *Disbelief in the existence of a Divine Being is not equivalent to a demonstration that there is no God.*

2. *Such a demonstration is from the nature of the case impossible.* It was well observed by the late Prof. Calderwood of the Edinburgh University that "the divine existence is a truth so plain that it needs no proof, as it is a truth so high that it admits of none." As Dr. Chalmers long ago observed, before one can positively assert that there is no God, he must arrogate to himself the wisdom and ubiquity of God. He must explore the entire circuit of the universe to be sure that no God is there. He must have interrogated all the generations of mankind and all the hierarchies of heaven to be certain they had never heard of a God. In short, as Chalmers puts it, "for man not to know God, he has only to sink beneath the level of our common nature. But to deny God he must be God himself."

3. *Denial of the divine existence is not warranted by inability to discern traces of God's presence in the universe.* "I cannot see," Huxley wrote, "one shadow or tittle of evidence that the Great Unknown underlying the phenomena of the universe stands to us in the relation of a Father, loves and cares for us as Christianity asserts." Blatchford also with equal emphasis affirms: "I cannot believe that God is a personal God who interferes in human affairs. I cannot see in science, or in experience, or in history, any signs of such a God or of such intervention." The incapacity of Huxley and Blatchford either to see or hear God may, and no doubt does, serve as an explanation of their atheistical creed, but assuredly it is not justification of the same, since a profounder reasoner than either has said: "The invisible things of God since creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity; so that they [who believe not] are without excuse."

The majority of mankind, not in Christian countries only, but also in heathen lands, from the beginning of the world onward, have believed in the existence of a Supreme Being. They may frequently, as Paul says, have "changed the glory of the incor-

ruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts and creeping things"; but deeply seated in their natures, debased though these were by sin, lay the conception of a Superhuman Power to whom they owed allegiance and whose favor was indispensable to their happiness. It was a saying of Plutarch that in his day a man might travel the world over without finding a city without temples and gods. It may be set down as incontrovertible that the vast majority of mankind have possessed some idea of a Supreme Being; so that if the truth or falsehood of the proposition, "There is no God," is to be determined by the counting of votes, the question is settled in the negative, that is, against the atheist's creed.

II. THE CONFESSION OF THE AGNOSTIC

"I Cannot Tell Whether There Is A God Or Not"

Without dogmatically affirming that there is no God, the agnostic practically insinuates that whether there is a God or not, nobody can tell and it does not much matter. The agnostic does not deny that behind the phenomena of the universe there may be a Power; but whether there is or not, and if there is, whether that Power is a Force or a Person, are among the things unknown and unknowable, so that practically, it can never be more than a subject of curious speculation, like that which engages the leisure time of some astronomers, whether there be inhabitants in the planet Mars or not.

As thus expounded, the creed of the agnostic is open to serious objections.

1. It entirely ignores the spiritual factor in man's nature — either denying the soul's existence altogether, or viewing it as merely a function of the body; or, if regarding it as a separate entity distinct from the body, and using its faculties to apprehend and reason about external objects, yet denying its ability to discern spiritual realities. On either alternative, it is contradicted by both Scripture and experience. From Genesis to Revelation the Bible proceeds upon the assumption that "there is a spirit in man," which has power not only to apprehend things unseen but to see and know God and to be seen and known by him. Nor can it be denied that man is conscious of being more than

animated matter, and of having power to apprehend more than comes within the range of his senses; for he can and does entertain ideas and cherish feelings that have at least no direct connection with the senses, and can originate thoughts, emotions and volitions that have not been excited by external objects. It is as certain as language can make it that Abraham and Jacob, Moses and Joshua, Samuel and David, Isaiah and Jeremiah, had no doubt whatever that they knew God and were known of him; and multitudes of Christians exist today whom it would not be easy to convince that they could not and did not know God, although not through the medium of the senses or even of the pure reason.

2. It takes for granted that things cannot be adequately known unless they are fully known. This proposition, however, cannot be sustained in either science or philosophy, in ordinary life or in religious experience. Science knows there are such things as life and force, but confesses its ignorance of what life and force are as to their essence; all that is understood about them being their properties and effects. Philosophy can expound the laws of thought, but is baffled to explain the secret of thought itself; how it is excited in the soul by nerve-movements caused by impressions from without, and how it can express itself by originating counter-movements in the body. Nor is the case different in religious experience. The Christian, like Paul, may have no difficulty in saying, "Christ liveth in me," but he cannot explain to himself or others, how. Hence the inference must be rejected that because the finite mind cannot fully comprehend the infinite, therefore it cannot know the infinite at all, and must remain forever uncertain whether there is a God or not. Scripture, it should be noted, does not say that any finite mind can fully find out God; but it does say that men may know God from the things which he has made, and more especially from the image of himself which has been furnished in Jesus Christ, so that if they fail to know him, they are without excuse.

3. It virtually undermines the foundations of morality. For if one cannot tell whether there is a God or not, how can one be sure that there is any such thing as morality? The distinctions between right and wrong which one makes in the regulation of his conduct may be altogether baseless. It is true a struggle may

be made to keep them up out of a prudential regard for future safety, out of a desire to be on the winning side in case there should be a God. But it is doubtful if the imperative "ought" would long resound within one's soul, were the conclusions once reached that no one could tell whether behind the phenomena of nature or of consciousness there was a God or not. Morality no more than religion can rest on uncertainties.

III. THE BOAST OF THE MATERIALIST

"I Do Not Need a God, I Can Run the Universe Without One"

Only grant him to begin with an ocean of atoms and a force to set them in motion and he will forthwith explain the mystery of creation. If we have what he calls a scientific imagination, he will let us see the whole process — the molecules or atoms combining and dividing, advancing and retiring, forming groups, building up space-filling masses, growing hotter and hotter as they wheel through space, whirling swifter and swifter, till through sheer velocity they swell and burst, after which they break up into fragments and cool down into a complete planetary system.

Inviting us to light upon this globe, the materialist will show us how through long centuries, mounting up to millions of years, the various rocks which form the earth's crust were deposited. Nay, if we will dive with him to the bottom of the ocean he will point out the first speck of dead matter that sprang into life, protoplasm, though he cannot tell when or how.

Concerning this theory of the universe, however, it is pertinent to make these remarks:

1. Taken at its full value, with unquestioning admission of the alleged scientific facts on which it is based, *it is at best only an inference or working hypothesis, which may or may not be true and which certainly cannot claim to be beyond dispute.*

2. *Conceding all that evolutionists demand, that from matter and force the present cosmos has been developed, the question remains, whether this excluded or renders unnecessary the intervention of God as the prime mover in the process.* If it does, one would like to know whence matter and force came. Moreover, one would like to know how these atoms or electrons came to attract

and repel one another and form combinations, if there was no original cause behind them and no aim before them.

Against this pantheistical assumption must ever lie the difficulty of explaining how or why the God that was latent in matter or force, was so long in arriving at consciousness in man, and how before man appeared, the latent God being unconscious could have directed the evolutionary process which fashioned the cosmos. Till these inquiries are satisfactorily answered, it will not be possible to accept the materialistic solution of the universe.

IV. THE DECLARATION OF THE CHRISTIAN

"I Cannot Do Without a God. Without a God I Can Neither Account for the Universe Around Me, Nor Explain Jesus Christ Above Me, Nor Understand the Spiritual Experiences Within Me."

1. *Without a God the material universe around the Christian is and remains a perplexing enigma.*

When he surveys that portion of the universe which lies open to his gaze, he sees marks of wisdom, power and goodness that irresistibly suggest the idea of a God. When he looks upon the stellar firmament with its innumerable orbs, and considers their disposition and order, their balancing and circling, he instinctively argues that these shining suns and systems must have been created, arranged and upheld by a Divine Mind. When, restricting his attention to the earth on which he stands, he notes the indications of design which are everywhere visible, as witnessed, for example, in the constancy of nature's laws and forces, in the endless variety of nature's forms, inanimate and animate, as well as in their wonderful gradation not only in their kinds but also in the times of their appearing, and in the marvelous adjustment of organs to environment; he feels constrained to reason that these things are not the result of chance which is blind or the spontaneous output of matter, which in itself, so far as known to him, is powerless, lifeless and unintelligent, but can only be the handiwork of a Creative Mind. When further he reflects that in the whole round of human experience, effects have never been known to be produced without causes; that designs have never been known to be conceived or worked out without designers and

artificers; that dead matter has never been known to spring into life either spontaneously or by the application of means; that one kind of life has never been known to transmute itself spontaneously or to be transmuted artificially into another, neither a vegetable into an animal, nor an animal into a man; he once more feels himself shut up to the conclusion that the whole cosmos must be the production of mind, even of a Supreme Intelligence infinitely powerful, wise and good. Like the Hebrew psalmist he feels impelled to say, "O Lord! how manifold are thy works: in wisdom hast thou made them all!"

Should the philosopher interject, that this argument does not necessarily require an Infinite Intelligence, but only an artificer capable of constructing such a universe as the present, the answer is that, if such an artificer existed, he himself would require to be accounted for, since beings that are finite must have begun to be, and therefore must have been caused. Accordingly, this artificer must have been preceded by another greater than himself, and that by another still greater, and so on travelling backwards forever.

2. *Without a God the Christian cannot explain to himself the Person of Jesus.*

Fixing attention solely on the Gospels, the Christian discerns a personality that cannot be accounted for on ordinary principles. It is not merely that Jesus performed works such as none other man did, and spoke words such as never fell from mortal lips; it is that in addition his life was one of incomparable goodness — of unwearied philanthropy, self-sacrificing love, lowly humility, patient meekness and spotless purity — such as never before had been witnessed on earth, and never since has been exhibited by any of his followers. It is that Jesus, being such a personality as described by those who beheld his glory to be that of the only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth, put forth such pretensions and claims as were wholly unfitting in the lips of a mere man, and much more of a sinful man, declaring himself to be the Light of the World and the Bread of Life: giving out that he had power to forgive sins and to raise the dead; that he had pre-existed before he came to earth and would return to that pre-existent state when his work was done, which work was to die for men's sins: that he would rise from the dead and ascend up into

heaven, both of which he actually did; and asserting that he was the Son of God, the equal of the Father and the future Judge of mankind. The Christian studying this picture perceives that, while to it belong the lineaments of a man, it also wears the likeness of a God, and he reasons that if that picture was drawn from the life (and how otherwise could it have been drawn?), then a God must once have walked this earth in the person of Jesus. For the Christian no other conclusion is possible.

3. *Without a God the Christian cannot understand the facts of his own consciousness.*

Take first the idea of God of which he finds himself possessed on arriving at the age of intelligence and responsibility. How it comes to pass that this great idea should arise within him if no such being as God exists, is something he cannot understand. To say that he has simply inherited it from his parents or absorbed it from his contemporaries, is not to solve the problem, but only to put it back from generation to generation. The question remains, How did this idea first originate in the soul? To answer that it gradually grew up out of totemism and animism as practiced by the low-grade races who, impelled by superstitious fears, conceived material objects to be inhabited by ghosts or spirits, is equally an evasion of the problem. Because again the question arises, How did these low-grade races arrive at the conception of spirits as distinguished from bodies or material objects in general? Should it be responded that veneration for deceased ancestors begat the conception of a God, one must further demand by what process of reasoning they were conducted from the conception of as many gods as there were deceased ancestors to that of one Supreme Deity or Lord of all. The only satisfactory explanation of the latent consciousness of God which man in all ages and lands has shown himself to be possessed of is, that it is one of the soul's intuitions, a part of the intellectual and moral furniture with which it comes into the world; that at first this idea or intuition lies within the soul as a seed corn which gradually opens out as the soul rises into full possession of its powers and is appealed to by external nature; that had sin not entered into the world this idea or intuition would have everywhere expanded into full bloom, filling the soul with a clear and

radiant conception of the Divine Being, in whose image it has been made; but that now in consequence of the blighting influence of sin this idea or intuition has been everywhere more or less dimmed or weakened and in heathen nations corrupted and debased.

Then rising to the distinctly religious experience of conversion, the Christian encounters a whole series or group of phenomena which to him are inexplicable, if there is no God. Conscious of a change partly intellectual but mainly moral and spiritual, a change so complete as to amount to an inward revolution, what Scripture calls a new birth or a new creation, he cannot trace it to education or to environment, to philosophical reflection or to prudential considerations. The only reasonable account he can furnish of it is that he has been laid hold of by an unseen but Superhuman Power, so that he feels constrained to say like Paul: "By the grace of God I am what I am." And not only so, but as the result of this inward change upon his nature, he realizes that he stands in a new relation to that Supreme Power which has quickened and renewed him, that he can and does enter into personal communion with him through Jesus Christ, addressing to him prayers and receiving from him benefits and blessings in answer to those prayers.

These experiences of which the Christian is conscious may be characterized by the non-Christian as illusions, but to the Christian they are realities; and being realities they make it simply impossible for him to believe there is no God. Rather they inspire him with confidence that God is, and is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him, and that of him and through him and to him are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

22

God in Christ the Only Revelation of the Fatherhood of God

By Robert E. Speer

Abridged and emended by James H. Christian, Th.D.

They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth service unto God. And these things will they do, because they have not known the Father nor me (John 16: 2, 3).

These words suggest to us that it is not enough for a man just to believe in God. Everything depends on what kind of a god it is in whom he believes. It is a rather striking and surprising comparison at first that our Lord institutes here between a mere belief in God and the possibly horrible moral consequences, on the one hand, and a knowledge of God in Christ and its sure moral effects, on the other. And the lesson would seem to be the inadequacy of any religious faith that does not recognize the revelation of the Father in Jesus Christ and that does not know Jesus Christ as God. It is a little hard for us to take such a great thought as this into our lives, and yet our Lord puts it in unmistakable clearness: on the one hand, the moral inadequacy of a mere belief in God; on the other hand, the moral and spiritual adequacy of a recognition of God as Father exposed in Christ as God.

Theism Not Sufficient

In the former of these two verses our Lord makes the first of these two points unmistakably clear. He saw no adequate guarantee of moral rectitude and justice in a mere theistic faith. He suffered in his own death the possibly bitter fruits of a mere theistic faith. The men who put him to death were ardent believers in God, and they thought they were doing a fine thing for God when they crucified the Son of God. And he told his disciples that the day would come when conscientious men would take out service of

God in executing them; and that those who would put them to death would not be bad men, but men who thought that by killing them they were doing God's will.

We see exactly the same great error in our own day. It is no sufficient protection to a man to believe in one God. Our Lord understood completely that a mere faith in God was not going to make a good man, that a man might believe in God and be a murderer, or an adulterer; he might believe in God and put the very apostles of Jesus Christ to death and think that thus he was doing God a great service.

Conscientiousness Not Sufficient

It seems to me that it is worthwhile to stop here for a moment incidentally to note how easy a thing it is for a man to be guilty of conscientious error and crime. It is no defense of a man's conduct to say that he is conscientiously satisfied with what he did. I suppose that most bad things have been done in all good conscience, and that most of the sins that we commit today we commit with a perfectly clean conscience. There is such a thing as a moral color-blindness that is just as real as a physical color-blindness. I was visiting a little while ago one of our well-known girl's schools, and had a discussion with one of the teachers, who said that she thought it did not make so much difference what a pupil believed or did, provided only she was conscientious in her belief and conduct. I told her that it must be quite easy to go to school to her if it did not matter whether you answered right or not, if only you were conscientiously honest in what you said. She might get two absolutely contrary answers to a question and mark each one of them perfect. The whole foundations of the moral universe fall out from beneath the man or the woman who will take that view of it, that there is not really any objective standard of right or wrong at all, that everything hinges on just how a person feels about it, and if they only feel comfortable over the thing it is all right. These men who were going to put the disciples of Jesus Christ to death had no qualms of conscience about it. They would think in doing it that they were doing God a service. The idea that our Lord means to bring out is this, that the standards of a man are dependent upon his conception of God, and he saw no guarantee

about I
saw this!
typically
modern.

of moral rectitude and justice in a man's life except as that man grasped the revelation of God as Father that had been made in Jesus Christ, and himself knew Jesus Christ as God.

Christ's Mention of "Father"

There is no room here to trace this great thought through all the teaching of our Lord. Lately, I read through the last discourses of Jesus in John with this in mind. Only four times does Jesus so much as mention the name of God, while he speaks of the Father at least forty times. Evidently our Lord conceived that his great message to men was a message of God as Father revealed in his own life, and he conceived this to be a great practical moral truth, that was to save men from those errors of judgment, of act, and of character about which a man has no sure guarantee under a mere monotheistic faith.

In Relation to Our Religious Faith

1. I think we might just as well now go right to the heart of the thing by considering, first of all, *the relationship of this revelation that Jesus Christ made of the Father-character of God in himself to our own religious faith.* We begin our Christian creed with the declaration, "I believe in God the Father Almighty." I believe that no man can say those words sincerely and honestly, with an intellectual understanding of what he is saying, who is not saying them with his feet solidly resting on the evangelical conviction; for we know practically nothing about God *as* Father except what we learn from the revelation of God as Father in Jesus Christ. Men say sometimes that the idea of God as Father was in the Old Testament, and there is a sense doubtless in which we can find it there: the Hebrews thought of God as the Father, the national Father of Israel.

Now and then there is some splendid burst in the prophets that contains that idea, as when Jeremiah, crying out for God, says, "I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn." Or when Israel is itself crying out through Isaiah, "Jehovah is our Father. He is the potter and we are the clay." But in each sense it is a sort of nationalistic conception of God as the Father of the whole people, Israel. Turn some time to the 103rd Psalm, where there is the best expression of it, "Like as a father pitieth his children,

so the Lord pitieth them that fear him," and even there it is the national cry. Or turn to the 89th Psalm, and there, too, it is national and patriotic: "He shall cry unto me, thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation." And if in all the great body of the religious poetry of Israel there are only two or three distinct notes of the fatherhood of God, we cannot believe that that idea filled any very large place in the heart of Israel. And in the very last of all the Old Testament prophecies, the complaint of God is just this, that the Israelites would not conceive of him as their Father, and that even the political conception of God as the Father of the nation was no reality in the experience of the people.

A New Conception

The revelation of God as the Father of men was a practically new conception exposed in the teaching and in the life of our Lord Jesus Christ — not in his teaching alone. We should never have known God as Father by the message of Jesus Christ only; we should never have been able to conceive what Christ's idea of God was if we had not seen that idea worked out in the very person of Jesus Christ himself. It was not alone that he told us what God was. He said that when he walked before men, he was himself one with the Father on whom the eyes of men might gaze: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me. If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also; from henceforth ye have known him and have seen him. Philip saith unto him, Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus said unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth his works."

John and Matthew

We cannot separate the Christological elements of the Gospel from the Gospel. The effort is made by throwing the Gospel of John out of court, and then we are told that with the Gospel of John gone, the real work of Christ was just in his message, making known the Father to men; and that the Christological

character that we impose upon the Gospel was something foisted upon it later, and not something lying in the mind and thought of Jesus Christ himself. But I do not see how men can take that view of it until they cut out also the 11th chapter of Matthew. Christ sets forth there the essentially Christological character of his Gospel just as unmistakably as it is set forth anywhere in the Gospel of John: "No man knoweth the Son save the Father; and no man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." You cannot tear Christ's revelation of the fatherhood of God away from the person of Christ. He did not expose the fatherhood of God by what he said; he exposed the fatherhood of God by what he was; and it is a species of intellectual misconception to take certain words of his and say those words entitle us to believe in God as our Father, while we reject Jesus Christ as his Divine Son, and think that it is possible to hold to the first article of our Christian creed without going on to the second article of it, "And I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord."

Christ Is All

If you and I subtract from our conception of God what we owe to the person of Jesus Christ, we have practically nothing left. The disciples knew that they would have little left. When it was proposed that they should separate themselves from Christ and the revelation that he was making, these men stood absolutely dumbfounded. "Why, Lord," they said, "what is to become of us? We have no place to go. Thou hast the words of eternal life. There is nothing for us in Judaism any more." Monotheism was in Judaism; the revelation of God was in Judaism; but that was nothing to the disciples now that they had seen that glorious vision of his Father made known to men in Jesus Christ his Son. It would seem to follow that our attitude towards Jesus Christ is determinative of our life in the Father, and that the imagination that we have a life in the Father that rests on a rejection of the claims of Jesus Christ is an imagination with no foundations under it at all. Take those great words of our Lord: "He that loveth me not keepeth not my words; and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me. If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will

come unto him and make our abode with him." What Jesus is setting forth there as the condition of a right attitude toward God is a man's acceptance of the inner secret of his own life, a man's deliberate committing of himself to the great principles that underlie the character and the person of Jesus, a sympathetic union with himself. And he summed it all up in those words to Philip, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." It is in this sense, I say, that you and I cannot honestly declare that we "believe in God the Father" unless we go right on to say, "And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord," for we know practically nothing about God as Father except what was revealed of God as Father in him who said, "I and the Father are one." Do we believe in the fatherhood of God in that sense?

Practical Application

2. Perhaps we can answer that question better by going on to ask, in the second place, whether we are *realizing in our lives all the practical implications of this revelation of the Father-character of God in Jesus Christ*. For one thing, think how it *interprets the mystery and the testing of life*. Now life is simply an enigma on the merely theistic hypothesis. We get absolutely no comfort, no light, no illumination upon what we know to be the great problem of life from a simple belief in God. It only becomes intelligible to us as we understand God to be our Father in the sense in which Jesus Christ revealed him. Dr. Babcock used to put it in the simple phrase: "You have got to take one of two interpretations of it. You have got to read it in the terms of fatherhood." Once I accept the revelation of God made in Jesus Christ, my life is still a hard problem to me. There are many things in it that are terribly confused and difficult still; but I begin to get a little light on its deep and impenetrable mysteries. It was just in this point of view that the writer of the great Epistle to the Hebrews thought he had some clue to the mystery of his own life, to the chastening of it, to the hard and burning discipline through which he sees we are all passing. It was only when he conceived of himself as being a son of the great Potter who was shaping the clay himself that the mystery began to clear a little from his pathway. And it was just so, you remember, that Christ got light on the mystery of his life: "Father, not my will, but thine be done."

Only as he remembered and rested deeply upon the character of God as his Father did those great experiences through which he was passing have full intelligibility to him. After all, it was no fancy that connected the two great ideas of Isaiah, the living idea of the fatherhood of God and the metaphorical idea of God as the Potter shaping his clay. It is only so that we understand both aspects of our human life. When the wheel moves fast, and the hand of the Potter seems cruel upon the clay, and the friction is full of terrible heat, we begin to understand something of it all in realizing that the Potter's hand is the hand of a Father shaping in fatherly discipline the life of his son. "If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as sons."

Our Ideals

Or think, in the second place, how this conception of God *inspires and rectifies the ideals of our lives*. It was this that suggested the idea to Jesus here. He saw that there was absolutely no guarantee of right standards of life in a mere theistic faith, and there is none. We have no guarantee whatever of just and perfect moral ideals that we do not get from the exposure of the Father-character of God in the person of Jesus Christ and from personal union with God in him.

As a simple matter of fact the best ideals of our life we all owe to just that revelation. The ideal of purity — the Jews never had it. They had an ideal of ritual cleanliness, but they had no Christian ideal of moral purity. You cannot find the ideal of purity anywhere in the world where the conception of the Father-revelation of God in Christ has not gone. Explain it as you will, it is a simple fact of comparative religion. Can any man find the full ideal of moral purity anywhere in this world where it has not been created by the revelation of the Father-character of God in Christ? We owe it to that, and we cannot be sure of its perpetuation save where the conviction of that great revelation abides in the faith of man.

Or take our ideal of work. Where did Christ get his ideal of work? "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." On what ground did he rest his claim upon men to work? "Son, go work today in my vineyard." Our whole ideal of a workingmen's life,

of a man's using his life to the fullness of its power in an unselfish service, is an ideal born of the revelation of the Father-character of God in Christ. And forgiveness is an ideal of the same kind. We owe all the highest and noblest ideals of our life to that revelation. And it seems to us something less than fair for a man to take those ideals and then deny their origin, trampling under foot the claims of him from whom those ideals came into our lives.

Sweetens Obedience

And think *how rational and sweet this conception of God makes obedience.* There is something rational but hardly sweet in the thought of obedience to him under the simple theistic conception. All the joy of obedience comes when I think of myself as my Father's son and sent to do my Father's will. Our Lord thought of his life just so. "Simon," he said — that last night that Simon tried to defend him by force — "put up thy sword into its sheath. The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" We get our ideals of obedience and the joy and the delight of obedience from the thought that after all we are simply to obey our Father. In the 14th chapter of the Gospel of John, we get a little vision of what Christ conceives to be the sweetness and the tenderness and the beauty that can come into life from a real acceptance of this revealing of his. "In that day," he says, "ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and will manifest myself unto him. If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him."

Relation to Prayer Life

3. And, last of all, think on *the light that this conception of God throws upon our life of prayer.* I suspect that prayer has been just a sham to many of us, or a thing that we have done, because other people told us it was the thing to do. We never got anything out of it; it never meant anything to us. We might just as well have talked to stone walls as to pray the way we have prayed. We went out and said, "God," and we might just as well have said, "hills," or "mountains," or "trees," or

anything else. Why have we not gone into the school of Christ and learned there, alike from his practice and his doctrine, what real prayer is and how a man can do it.

I hope I am not misunderstood. I am meaning only that Christ's conception of God and his practice of prayer did not rest merely on the theistic interpretation of the universe and the nature of its Creator in his majesty and almightiness. They rested on the Father-conception which he revealed in himself. Just run over in your thought his prayers: the prayer that he taught us to pray, "Our Father, who art in heaven"; the prayer he offered himself when the disciples of John the Baptist came to him: "I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and the understanding, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for it seemeth good in thy sight"; the prayer that he offered in the temple, when Philip and Andrew came to him with the message about the Greeks who were seeking to see him: "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour"; the prayer that he offered before the grave of Lazarus, "Father, I thank thee that thou hearest me, and I know that thou hearest me always"; the prayer that he put up in Gethsemane, "My Father, if this cup cannot pass from me except I drink it, thy will be done"; and the last prayer of all, when, as a tired little child, he lay down in his Father's arms and fell asleep; "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." What a reality this conception of prayer gives to it. We are not praying to any cold theistic God alone; we are praying to our Father made real to us, warm with the warmth of a great tenderness for us, living with a great consciousness of all our human suffering and struggle and conflict and need.

It makes prayer, for one thing, a rational thing. I can go to my Father and ask him for the things that I need. There is an exquisite passage in Andrew Bonar's journals in which he speaks of sitting one day in his study, and looking out of his window and seeing two of his children pass through the fields. He said as he saw those little children making their way across the fields, the love in his heart overcame him, and he pushed his books

Beautiful
away from him on the table, and went to the door and called out across the field to them, and they came running eagerly in response to their father's loving call. And when they had come and he had carressed them, he said he gave each one of them something simply because the ecstasy of his fatherly love made it impossible that he should not do something then for those two children who were so dear to his heart. Do you suppose that God is an inferior sort of a father? Prayer in the sense of supplication for real things becomes a rational reality to men who believe in God in Jesus Christ.

Fellowship

And how sweet it makes prayer in the sense of living fellowship. Do you suppose that we are nobler characters than that great Father after whom these human fatherhoods of ours are named? Do you suppose that if it is sweet to us to have our little children come creeping to us in the dark, it is not sweet to our heavenly Father here, everywhere, to have men, his sons, come stealing to his side and his love? This is no excessive way of putting it. Is it not guaranteed to us by those words which our Lord spoke that Easter morning as he stood there by his open grave, and the woman who adored him was about to clasp his feet, "Mary, go and tell my disciples that I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, my God and your God." Yes, that is the right way to put it today. No God for us, nowhere through the whole universe a real and satisfying God for us, except the God who is discovered to us in Jesus Christ, and who is calling to us today by the lips of Christ, "My son, O my son," and who would have us call back to him, if we be true men, "My Father, O my Father."

23

The Deity of Christ

By Prof. Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL. D.

Princeton Theological Seminary

Revised and edited by Gerald B. Stanton, Th.D.

A noted writer has remarked that our assured conviction of the deity of Christ rests, not upon "proof-texts or passages, nor upon old argument drawn from these, but upon the general face of the whole manifestation of Jesus Christ, and of the whole impression left by him upon the world." His antithesis is too absolute, and possibly betrays an unwarranted distrust of the evidence of Scripture. To make it acceptable, we should read the statement rather: "Our conviction of the deity of Christ rests not alone on the scriptural passages which assert it, but also upon his entire impression on the world." Or perhaps: "Our conviction rests not more on the scriptural assertions than upon his entire manifestation." Both lines of evidence are valid, and when twisted together form an unbreakable cord. The proof-texts and passages do prove that Jesus was esteemed divine by those who companied with him; that he esteemed himself divine; that he was recognized as divine by those who were taught by the Spirit; that, in fine, he was divine. But over and above this biblical evidence, the impression Jesus has left upon the world bears independent testimony to his deity, and it may well be that to many minds this will seem the most conclusive of all its evidences. It certainly is very cogent and impressive.

The Nature of Evidence

A man recognizes on sight the face of his friend, or his own handwriting. Ask him how he knows this face to be that of his friend, or this handwriting to be his own, and he may be dumb, or, seeking to reply, may babble nonsense. Yet his recognition rests on solid grounds, though he lacks analytical skill to isolate and

state these solid grounds. We believe in God and freedom and immortality on good grounds, though we may not be able satisfactorily to analyze these grounds. No true conviction exists without adequate rational grounding in evidence. So, if we are solidly assured of the deity of Christ, it will be on adequate grounds, appealing to the reason. But it may well be on grounds not analyzed, perhaps not analyzable, by us, so as to exhibit themselves in the forms of formal logic.

We do not need to wait to analyze the grounds of our convictions before they operate to produce convictions, any more than we need to wait to analyze our food before it nourishes us. The Christian's conviction of the deity of his Lord does not depend for its soundness on the Christian's ability convincingly to state the grounds of his conviction. The evidence he offers for it may be wholly inadequate, while the evidence on which it rests may be absolutely compelling.

Testimony in Solution

The very abundance and persuasiveness of the evidence for the deity of Christ greatly increases the difficulty of stating it adequately. This is true even of the scriptural evidence, as precise and definite as much of it is. For it is a true remark of Dr. Dale's that the particular texts in which it is definitely asserted are far from whole, or even the most impressive, proofs which the Scriptures supply of our Lord's deity. He compares these texts to the salt-crystals which appear on the sand of the sea-beach after the tide has receded. "These are not," he remarks, "the strongest, though they may be the most apparent, proofs that the sea is salt; the salt is present in solution in every bucket of sea-water." The deity of Christ is in solution in every page of the New Testament. Every word that is spoken of him, every word which he is reported to have spoken of himself, is spoken on the assumption that he is God. That is the reason why the "criticism" which addresses itself to eliminating the testimony of the New Testament to the deity of our Lord has set itself a hopeless task. The New Testament itself would have to be eliminated. Nor can we get behind this testimony. Because the deity of Christ is the presupposition of every word of the New Testament, it is impossible to select words out of the New Testament from which to construct earlier

documents in which the deity of Christ shall not be assumed. The assured conviction of the deity of Christ is contemporary with Christianity itself. There never was a Christianity, neither in the times of the Apostles nor since, of which this was not a prime tenet.

A Saturated Gospel

Let us observe in an example or two how thoroughly saturated the Gospel narrative is with the assumption of the deity of Christ, so that it crops out in the most unexpected ways and places.

In three passages of Matthew, reporting words of Jesus, he is represented as speaking familiarly and in the most natural manner in the world, of "*his* angels" (13:41; 16:27; 24:31). In all three he designates himself as the "Son of man"; and in all three there are additional suggestions of his majesty. "The Son of man shall send forth *his* angels, and they shall gather out of *his* kingdom all things that cause stumbling and those that do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire."

Who is this Son of man who has angels, by whose instrumentality the final judgment is executed at his command? "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with *his* angels; and then shall *he* reward every man according to his deeds." Who is this Son of man surrounded by *his* angels, in whose hand are the issues of life? The Son of man "shall send forth *his* angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together *his* elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Who is this Son of man at whose behest his angels winnow men? A scrutiny of the passages will show that it is not a peculiar body of angels which is meant by the Son of man's angels, but just the angels as a body, who are his to serve him as he commands. In a word, Jesus Christ is above angels (Mark 13:32) — as is argued at explicit length at the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews. "To which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand . . ." (Heb. 1:13).

Heaven Come to Earth

There are three parables recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Luke as spoken by our Lord in his defense against the murmurs of the Pharisees at his receiving sinners and eating with them. The

essence of the defense which our Lord offers for himself is, that there is joy *in heaven* over repentant sinners! Why "in heaven," "before the throne of God"? Is he merely setting the judgment of heaven over against that of earth, or pointing forward to his future vindication? By no means. He is representing his action in receiving sinners, in seeking the lost, as his proper action because it is the normal conduct of heaven manifested in him. He is heaven come to earth. His defense is thus simply the unveiling of the real nature of the transaction. The lost when they come to him are received because this is heaven's way; and *he* cannot act otherwise than in heaven's way. He tacitly assumes the good Shepherd's part as his own.

The Unique Position

All the great designations are not so much asserted as assumed by him for himself. He does not call himself a prophet, though he accepts this designation from others. He places himself above all the prophets, even above John, the greatest of the prophets, as him to whom all the prophets look forward. If he calls himself Messiah, he fills that term by doing so with a deeper significance, dwelling over on the unique relation of Messiah to God as his representative and his Son. Nor is he satisfied to represent himself merely as standing in unique relation to God. He proclaims himself to be the recipient of the divine fullness, the sharer in all that God has (Matt. 11:28). He speaks freely of himself indeed as God's Other, the manifestation of God on earth, whom to have seen was to have seen the Father also, and who does the work of God on earth. He openly claims divine prerogatives — the reading of the heart of man, the forgiveness of sins, the exercise of all authority in heaven and earth. Indeed, all that God has and is he asserts himself to have and be; omnipotence, omniscience, perfection belong as to the one so to the other. Not only does he perform all divine acts, his self-consciousness coalesces with the divine consciousness. If his followers lagged in recognizing his deity, this was not because he was not God or did not sufficiently manifest his deity. It was because they were foolish and slow of heart to believe what lay so patently before their eyes.

The Greatest Proof

The Scriptures give us evidence enough, then, that Christ is God. But the Scriptures are far from giving us all the evidence we have. There is, for example, the revolution which Christ has wrought in the world. If, indeed, it were asked what the most convincing proof of the deity of Christ is, perhaps the best answer would be, just Christianity. The new life he has brought into the world; the new creation which he has produced by his life and work in the world; here are at least his most palpable credentials.

Take it objectively. Read the historical account of the advance and conquest of Christianity in the days of the primitive Church, and then ask: Could these things have been wrought by power less than divine? And then remember that these things were not only wrought in that heathen world two thousand years ago, but have been wrought over again every generation since, for Christianity has re-conquered the world to itself each generation. Think of how the Christian proclamation spread, eating its way over the world like fire in the grass of a prairie. Think how, as it spread, it transformed lives. The thing, whether in its objective or in its subjective aspect, were incredible, had it not actually occurred. "Should a voyager," says Charles Darwin, "chance to be on the point of shipwreck on some unknown coast, he will most devoutly pray that the lesson of the missionary may have reached thus far. The lesson of the missionary is the enchanter's wand." Could this transforming influence, undiminished after two millenniums, have proceeded from a mere man? It is historically impossible that the great movement which we call Christianity, which remains unspent after all these years, could have originated in a merely human impulse, or could represent today the working of a merely human force.

The Proof Within

Or take it subjectively. Every Christian has within himself the proof of the transforming power of Christ, and can repeat the blind man's syllogism: Why herein is the marvel that ye know not whence he is, and yet he opened my eyes. "Shall we trust," demands an eloquent reasoner, "the touch of our fingers, the sight of our eyes, the hearing of our ears, and not trust our deepest consciousness of our higher nature — the answer of conscience,

the flower of spiritual gladness, the glow of spiritual love? To deny that spiritual experience is as real as physical experience is to slander the noblest faculties of our nature. It is to say that one half of our nature tells the truth, and the other half utters lies. The proposition that facts in the spiritual region are less real than facts in the physical realm contradicts all philosophy." The transformed hearts of Christians, registering themselves "in gentle tempers, in noble motives, in lives visibly lived under the empire of great aspirations" — these are the ever-present proofs of the divinity of the Person from whom their inspiration is drawn.

The supreme proof to every Christian of the deity of his Lord is then his own inner experience of the transforming power of his Lord upon the heart and life. Not more surely does he who feels the present warmth of the sun know that the sun exists, than he who has experienced the recreative power of the Lord know him to be his Lord and his God. Here is, perhaps we may say the proper, certainly we must say the most convincing, proof to every Christian of the deity of Christ; a proof which he cannot escape, and to which, whether he is capable of analyzing it or drawing it out in logical statement or not, he cannot fail to yield his sincere and unassailable conviction. Whatever else he may or may not be assured of, he knows that his Redeemer lives. Because he lives, we shall live also — that was the Lord's own assurance. Because we live, he lives also — that is the ineradicable conviction of every Christian heart.

24

The Virgin Birth of Christ

By the Rev. Prof. James Orr, D.D.

United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland

Revised and edited by Gerald B. Stanton, Th.D.

It is well known that the last half century has been marked by a determined assault upon the truth of the virgin birth of Christ. In the year 1892 a great controversy broke out in Germany, owing to the refusal of a pastor named Schrempf to use the Apostles' Creed in baptism because of disbelief in this and other articles. Schrempf was deposed, and an agitation commenced against the doctrine of the virgin birth which has grown in volume ever since. Other tendencies, especially the rise of an extremely radical school of historical criticism, added force to the negative movement. The attack is not confined, indeed, to the article of the virgin birth. It affects the whole supernatural estimate of Christ — his life, his claims, his sinlessness, his miracles, his resurrection from the dead. But the virgin birth is assailed with special vehemence, because it is supposed that the evidence for this miracle is more easily got rid of than the evidence for public facts, such as the resurrection. The result is that in very many quarters the virgin birth of Christ is openly treated as a fable, and belief in it is scouted as unworthy of the twentieth century intelligence.

The Unhappiest Feature

It is not only in the circles of unbelief that the virgin birth is discredited; in the church itself the habit is spreading of casting doubt upon the fact, or at least of regarding it as no essential part of Christian faith. This is the unhappiest feature in this unhappy controversy. The article, it is affirmed, did not belong to the earliest Christian tradition, and the evidence for it is not strong. Therefore, let it drop.

From the side of criticism, science, mythology, history and comparative religion, assault is thus made on this doctrine long so dear to the hearts of Christians and rightly deemed by them so vital to their faith. For loud as is the voice of denial, one fact must strike every careful observer of the conflict. Among those who reject the virgin birth of the Lord, few will be found — I do not know any — who take in other respects an adequate view of the person and work of the Saviour. Those who accept a full doctrine of the incarnation — that is, of a true entrance of the eternal Son of God into our nature for the purposes of man's salvation — with hardly an exception accept with it the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ, while those who repudiate or deny this article of faith either hold a lowered view of Christ's person, or more commonly, reject his supernatural claims altogether. The great bulk of the opponents of the virgin birth — those who are conspicuous by writing against it — are in the latter class.

The Case Stated

It is the object of this paper to show that those who take the lines of denial on the virgin birth just sketched do great injustice to the evidence and importance of the doctrine they reject. The evidence, if not of the same public kind as that for the resurrection, is far stronger than the objector allows, and the fact denied enters far more vitally into the essence of the Christian faith than he supposes. Placed in its right setting among the other truths of the Christian religion, it is not only no stumbling-block to faith, but is felt to fit in with self-evidencing power into the connection of these other truths, and to furnish the very explanation that is needed of Christ's holy and supernatural person. The ordinary Christian is a witness here. In reading the Gospels, he feels no incongruity in passing from the narratives of the virgin birth to the wonderful story of Christ's life in the chapters that follow, then from these to the pictures of Christ's divine dignity given in John and Paul. The whole is of one piece: the virgin birth is as natural at the beginning of the life of such an one — the divine Son — as the resurrection is at the end. And the more closely the matter is considered, the stronger does this impression grow. It is only when the scriptural conception of Christ is parted with that various difficulties and doubts come in.

A Superficial View

It is, in truth, a *very superficial* way of speaking or thinking of the virgin birth to say that nothing depends on this belief for our estimate of Christ. Who that reflects on the subject carefully can fail to see that if Christ was virgin born — if he was truly “conceived,” as the creed says, “by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary” — there must of necessity enter a supernatural element into his person; while, if Christ was sinless, much more, if he was the very Word of God incarnate, there must have been a miracle — the most stupendous miracle in the universe — in his origin? If Christ was, as John and Paul affirm and his Church has ever believed, the Son of God made flesh, the second Adam, the new redeeming Head of the race, a miracle was to be expected in his earthly origin; without a miracle such a person could never have been. Why then cavil at the narratives which declare the fact of such a miracle? Who does not see that the Gospel history would have been incomplete without them? Inspiration here only gives to faith what faith on its own grounds imperatively demands for its perfect satisfaction.

The First Promise

It is time now to come to the *Scripture itself*, and to look at the fact of the virgin birth in its historical setting, and its relation with other truths of the Gospel. As preceding the examination of the historical evidence, a little may be said, first, on the *Old Testament preparation*. Was there any such preparation? Some would say there was not, but this is not God's way, and we may look with confidence for at least some indications which point in the direction of the New Testament event.

One's mind turns first to that *oldest of all evangelical promises*, that the seed of the woman would bruise the head of the serpent. “I will put enmity,” says Jehovah to the serpent-tempter, “between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel” (Genesis 3:15, ASV). The “serpent” in this passage is Satan, and the “seed” who should destroy him is described emphatically as the *woman's* seed. It was the woman through whom sin had entered the race; by the seed of the woman would salvation come. The early church writers often pressed this analogy between Eve and the Virgin

Mary. We may reject any element of overexaltation of Mary they connected with it, but it remains significant that this peculiar phrase should be chosen to designate the future deliverer. I cannot believe the choice to be of accident. The promise to Abraham was that in his seed the families of the earth would be blessed; there the male is emphasized, but here it is the woman — the woman distinctively.

The Immanuel Prophecy

The idea of the Messiah, gradually gathering to itself the attributes of a divine King, reaches one of its clearest expressions in the great Immanuel prophecy, extending from Isaiah 7 to 9:7, and centering in the declaration: "The Lord himself will give you a sign; behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14; Cf. 8:8, 10). This is none other than the child of wonder extolled in chapter 9:6, 7. This is the prophecy quoted as fulfilled in Christ's birth in Matthew 1:23, and it seems also alluded to in the glowing promises to Mary in Luke 1:32, 33. It is pointed out in objection that the term rendered "virgin" in Isaiah does not necessarily bear this meaning; it denotes properly only a young unmarried woman. The context, however, seems clearly to lay an emphasis on the unmarried state, and the translators of the Greek version of the Old Testament (the Septagint) plainly so understood it when they rendered it by parthenos, a word which does mean "virgin." It is singular that the Jews themselves do not seem to have applied this prophecy at any time to the Messiah — a fact which disproves the theory that it was this text which suggested the story of a virgin birth to the early disciples.

Testimony of the Gospel

This record found in the prophetic Scriptures had apparently borne no fruit in Jewish expectations of the Messiah, when the event took place which to Christian minds made them luminous with predictive import. In Bethlehem of Judea, as Micah had foretold, was born of a virgin mother he whose "goings forth" were "from of old, from everlasting" (Micah 5:2; Matt. 2:6). Matthew, who quotes the first part of the verse, can hardly have been ignorant of the hint of pre-existence it contained. This

brings us to the testimony to the miraculous birth of Christ in our first and third Gospels — the only Gospels which record the circumstances of Christ's birth at all. By general consent the narratives in Matthew (chapters 1, 2) and in Luke (chapters 1, 2) are independent — that is, they are not derived one from the other — yet they both affirm, in detailed story, that Jesus, conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit, was born of a pure virgin, Mary of Nazareth, espoused to Joseph, whose wife she afterwards became. The birth took place at Bethlehem, whither Joseph and Mary had gone for enrollment in a census that was being taken. The announcement was made to Mary beforehand by an angel, and the birth was preceded, attended, and followed by remarkable events that are narrated (birth of the Baptist, with annunciations, angelic vision to the shepherds, visit of wise men from the east, etc.) The narratives should be carefully read at length to understand the comments that follow.

The Testimony Tested

There is no doubt, therefore, about the testimony to the virgin birth, and the question which now arises is — what is the *value* of these parts of the Gospels as evidence? Are they genuine parts of the Gospels? Or are they late and untrustworthy additions? From what sources may they be presumed to be derived? It is on the truth of the narratives that our belief in the virgin birth depends. Can they be trusted? Or are they mere fables, inventions, legends, to which no credit can be attached?

The answer to several of these questions can be given in very brief form. The narratives of the nativity in Matthew and Luke are undoubtedly *genuine parts* of their respective Gospels. They have been there since ever the Gospels themselves had an existence. The proof of this is convincing. The chapters in question are found in every manuscript and version of the Gospels known to exist. There are hundreds of manuscripts, some of them very old, belonging to different parts of the world, and many versions in different languages (Latin, Syriac, Egyptian, etc.), but these narratives of the virgin birth are found in all. We know, indeed, that a section of the early Jewish Christians — the Ebionites, as they are commonly called — possessed a Gospel based on Matthew from which the chapters on the nativity were

absent. But this was not the real Gospel of Matthew: it was at best a mutilated and corrupted form of it. The genuine Gospel, as the manuscripts attest, always had these chapters.

Next, as to the Gospels themselves, they were not of late and non-apostolic origin; but were written by apostolic men, and were from the first accepted and circulated in the church as trustworthy embodiments of sound apostolic tradition. Luke's Gospel was from Luke's own pen and Matthew's Gospel, while some dubiety still rests on its original language (Aramaic or Greek), passed without challenge in the early church as the genuine Gospel of the Apostle Matthew. The narratives come to us, accordingly, with high apostolic sanction.

As to the sources of the narratives concerning the virgin birth in these two Gospels, the information they convey was derived from no lower source than Joseph and Mary themselves. This is a marked feature of contrast in the narratives — that Matthew's account is all told from Joseph's point of view, and Luke's is all told from Mary's. The signs of this are unmistakable. Matthew tells about Joseph's difficulties and action, and says little or nothing about Mary's thoughts and feelings. Luke tells much about Mary — even her inmost thoughts — but says next to nothing directly about Joseph. The narratives are not, as some would have it, contradictory, but are independent and complementary. The one supplements and completes the other. Both together are needed to give the whole story. They bear in themselves the stamp of truth, honesty, and purity, and are worthy of all acceptance, as they were evidently held to be in the early church.

Unfounded Objections

Against the acceptance of these early, well-attested narratives, what, now, have the critics to allege? The objection on which most stress is laid is the *silence* on the virgin birth in the remaining Gospels, and other parts of the New Testament. This, it is held, conclusively proves that the virgin birth was not known in the earliest Christian circles, and was a legend of later origin. As respects the Gospels — Mark and John — the objection would only apply if it was the design of these Gospels to narrate, as the others do, the circumstances of the nativity. But this was

not their design. Both Mark and John knew that Jesus had a human birth — an infancy and early life — and that his mother was called Mary, but of deliberate purpose they tell us nothing about it. Mark begins his Gospel with Christ's entrance on his public ministry and says nothing of the period before, especially of how Jesus came to be called "the Son of God" (Mark 1:1). John traces the divine descent of Jesus, and tells us that the "Word became flesh" (John 1:14); but how this miracle of becoming flesh was wrought he does not say. It did not lie within his plan. He knew the church tradition on the subject: he had the Gospels narrating the birth of Jesus from the virgin in his hands, and he takes the knowledge of their teaching for granted. To speak of contradiction in a case like this is out of the question.

How far Paul was acquainted with the facts of Christ's earthly origin it is not easy to say. To a certain extent these facts would always be regarded as among the privacies of the innermost Christian circles — so long at least as Mary lived — and the details may not have been fully known till the Gospels were published. Paul admittedly did not base his preaching of his Gospel on these private, interior matters, but on the broad, public facts of Christ's ministry, death, and resurrection. It would be going too far, however, to infer from this that Paul had no knowledge of the miracle of Christ's birth. Luke was Paul's companion, and doubtless shared with Paul all the knowledge which he himself had gathered on this and other subjects. One thing certain is, that Paul could not have believed in the divine dignity, the pre-existence, the sinless perfection, and the redeeming headship of Jesus as he did, and not have been convinced that his entrance into humanity was no ordinary event of nature, but implied an unparalleled miracle of some kind. This Son of God, who "emptied" himself, who was "born of a woman, born under the law," "who knew no sin" (Phil. 2:7, 8; Gal. 4:4; II Cor. 5:21), was not and could not be a simple product of nature. God must have wrought creatively in his human origin. The virgin birth would be to Paul the most reasonable and credible of events. So also to John, who held the same high view of Christ's dignity and holiness.

Christ's Sinlessness a Proof

It is sometimes argued that a virgin birth is no aid to the explanation of Christ's *sinlessness*. Mary being herself sinful in nature, it is held the taint of corruption would be conveyed by one parent as really as by two. It is overlooked that the whole fact is not expressed by saying that Jesus was born of a virgin mother. There is the other factor — "conceived by the Holy Ghost." What happened was a divine, creative miracle wrought in the production of this new humanity which secured, from its earliest germinal beginnings, freedom from the slightest taint of sin. Paternal generation in such an origin is superfluous. The birth of Jesus was not, as in ordinary births, the creation of a new personality. It was a divine Person — already existing — entering on this new mode of existence. Miracle could alone effect such a wonder.

The Early Church a Witness

The history of the early Church is occasionally appealed to in witness that the doctrine of the virgin birth was not primitive. No assertion could be more futile. The early Church as far as we can trace it back, in all its branches, held this doctrine. No Christian sect is known that denied it, save the Jewish Ebionites formerly alluded to. The general body of the Jewish Christians — the Nazarenes as they are called — accepted it. Even the greater Gnostic sects in their own way admitted it. Those Gnostics who denied it were repelled with all the force of the church's greatest teachers. The Apostle John is related to have vehemently opposed Cerinthus, the earliest teacher with whom this denial is connected.

Doctrinally, the belief in the virgin birth of Christ is of the highest value for the right apprehension of Christ's unique and sinless personality. Here is one, as Paul brings out in Romans 5:12 ff., who, free from sin himself, and not involved in the Adamic liabilities of the race, reverses the curse of sin and death brought in by the first Adam, and establishes the reign of righteousness and life. Had Christ been naturally born, not one of these things could be affirmed of him. As one of Adam's race, not an entrant from a higher sphere, he would have shared in Adam's corruption and doom — would himself have required

to be redeemed. Through God's infinite mercy he came from above, inherited no guilt, needed no regeneration or sanctification, but became himself the Redeemer, Regenerator, Sanctifier, for all who receive him. "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift" (II Cor. 9:15).

1. Jesus claimed to be son of God
2. " " equality with "
3. " " Supremacy in both worlds
4. " " absolute power in dealing with questions of morality & destiny
5. Jesus asserted power to forgive sins
6. " " to raise His body
7. " " body of
8. Jesus declared He had ability to do Father's work
9. Jesus greatest gift to man John 3:16
10. " the center of rest for the soul.
11. " demands unhesitant, unlimited faith
12. _____

25

The God-Man

By John Stock

Revised and Edited by Rev. Glenn O'Neal, Ph. D.

Jesus of Nazareth was not mere man, excelling others in purity of life, sincerity of purpose, and fulness of his knowledge. He is the God-man. Such a view of the person of Messiah is the assured foundation of the entire Scriptural testimony to him, and it is to be irresistibly inferred from the style and strain in which he habitually spake of himself. Of this inferential argument of the Saviour we can give here the salient points only in briefest presentation.

1. *Jesus claimed to be the Son of God.* In his interview with Nicodemus he designated himself "The Only Begotten Son of God" (John 3:18). This majestic title is repeatedly appropriated to himself by our Master. When confronted with the Sanhedrin, Jesus was closely questioned about his use of this title; and he pleaded guilty to the indictment (see Matt. 26:63, 64, and 27:43; cf. Luke 22:70, 71, and John 19:7). It is clear from the narrative that the Jews understood this glorious name in the lips of Jesus to be a blasphemous assertion of divine attributes for himself.

They understood Jesus to thus claim *equality with God* (see John 5:18); and to *make himself God* (see John 10:33). Did they understand him? Did they overestimate the significance of this title as claimed by our Lord? How easy it would have been for him to set them right. How imperative were his obligations to do so, not merely to himself, but to these unhappy men who were thirsting for his blood under a misapprehension. Did not every principle of philanthropy require him to save them from the perpetration of the terrible murder which he knew they were contemplating? Yes, if they were mistaken, it was a heinous crime in our Lord not to correct the deception. But not a word did he say to soften down the

offensiveness of his claim. He allowed it to stand in all its repulsiveness to the Jewish mind, and died without making any sign that he had been misapprehended. He thus accepted the Jewish interpretation of his meaning, and sealed that sense of the title, *Son of God*, with his heart's blood. Nothing can be clearer, then, than the fact that Jesus died without a protest for claiming equality with God, and thus making himself God. We dare not trust ourselves to write what we must think of him under such circumstances, if he were a mere man.

2. *Jesus, on several occasions, claimed a divine supremacy in both worlds.* He claimed authority over the angels. Take for example his description of the final judgment: "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 13:41). The kingdom is his, and all the angels of God are his obedient servants.

He declared in the plainest terms that he will preside as the Universal Judge of men at the last great day, and that his wisdom and authority will award to every man his appropriate doom. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left" (Matt. 25:31-33). His voice will utter the cheering words, "Come, ye blessed," and the awful sentence, "Depart, ye cursed" (Matt. 25:31-46). Without hesitation, equivocation, or compromise Jesus of Nazareth repeatedly assumed the right and the ability to discriminate the moral character and desserts of all mankind from Adam to the day of doom. His sublime consciousness of universal supremacy relieved the claim of everything like audacity, and only made it the natural sequence of his incarnate Godhead. "All power," he said, "is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18).

This idea germinated in the minds of his followers and apostles. The vivid picture recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew gave a coloring to all their subsequent thoughts about their divine

Master. They ever after spake of him as "ordained to be the Judge of the quick and the dead" (Acts 10:42; 17:31). They testified that "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (II Cor. 5:10; Rom. 14:10).

Thus the mind of John the Apostle was prepared for the subsequent revelations of Patmos, when he heard his glorified Lord claim to "have the keys of hell and of death" (Rev. 1:18), and saw the vision of the "great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away" (Rev. 20:11).

But who is this that claims to grasp and wield the thunderbolts of eternal retribution; who professes to be able to scrutinize the secret purposes and motives, as well as the words and deeds, of every man that has been born, from the first dawn of personal responsibility to the day of death? Can anything short of indwelling omniscience qualify him for such an intricate and complicated and vast investigation? If he could not search "the reins and the hearts" (to use his own words to John), how could he give to every one of us according to his works (Rev. 2:23)? The brain reels when we think of the tremendous transactions of the last day, and the momentous interests then to be decided forever and ever; and reason tells us, that if the Judge who is to preside over these solemnities be a man, he must be a God-man. If Jesus is to be the universal and absolute Judge of our race — a Judge from whose decisions there will be no appeal, he must be "God manifest in the flesh." But what can we think of him, if in setting up this claim he mislead us?

3. *Jesus always claimed absolute and indisputable power in dealing with every question of moral duty and destiny.* Jesus claimed to be absolute Lord in the whole region of morals. He settled the meaning and force of old laws, and instituted new ones by his own authority. Take the Sermon on the Mount as an illustration. With what a self-possessed peremptoriness does he define the existing legislation of God, and enlarge its limits! With what conscious dignity does he decide every question in the whole range of human duty with the simple — "But I say unto you!" Seven times in one chapter does he use this formula (see Matt. 5:20, 22, 28, 32,

34, 39, 44). And in the application of the sermon he declared him only to be the wise man and built upon solid rock, who hears his sayings and does them (Matt. 7:24). Well might the people be astonished at his doctrine; for verily "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes" (Matt. 7:28, 29). But the tone which pervades the Sermon on the Mount runs through the whole of the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. He ever speaks as if he were the Author and Giver of the law; as if he had the power to modify any of its provisions according to his own ideas of fitness; and as if he were the Supreme Lord of human consciences. His style is utterly unlike that of any inspired teacher before or after him. They appealed to the law and to the testimony (see Isa. 8:20). But Jesus claimed an inherent power to modify and to alter both.

The Sabbath was the symbol of the entire covenant made by God with Israel through the ministry of Moses (see Exod. 31:12-17). But Jesus asserted his complete supremacy over this divine institution. These were his emphatic words: "For the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day" (Matt. 12:8; Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5). He could, of his own will, relax the terrors of the Jewish Sabbath, and even supersede it altogether by the Christian "Lord's Day." He was Lord of all divine institutions.

And in the Church he claims the right to regulate her doctrines and her ordinances according to his will. The apostles he commissioned to baptize in his name, and charged them to teach their converts to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them (Matt. 28:19-20). Thus John was prepared for the sublime vision of the Son of man as "He that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks" (Rev. 2:1); and as "He that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth" (Rev. 3:7).

And the authority which Jesus claimed extends into heaven, and to the final state of things. He affirmed that he would ascend to share his Father's dominion, and to sit in the throne of his glory (see Matt. 19:28). The counterpart to which announcement is found in his declaration to John in Patmos: "to him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also

overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne" (Rev. 3:21). The manner in which the Lord spake of himself in connection with the heavenly state bore much fruit in the hearts and sentiments of his disciples. To them this life was being "absent from the Lord" as to his visible presence; and their one beautiful idea of heaven was that it was being "present with the Lord" (II Cor. 5:6, 8). He had taught them to regard him as their "all in all," even in their eternal state; and with unquestioning faith they cherished the one blessed hope of being forever with the Lord. All other ideas of the celestial world were lost sight of in comparison with this absorbing anticipation.

The very mansions which they were to occupy in the Eternal Father's house, Jesus said, he would assign to them (John 14:2). He asserted his right to give away the crowns and glories of immortal blessedness as if they were his by indisputable right. He wills it, and it is done. He constantly reminded his disciples of rewards which he would give to every servant whom, at his coming, he found to be faithful (cf. Matt. 24:44 with 45, 46, 47; 25: 14-46, etc.).

It is true Jesus will give these honors only to those for whom they are prepared by his Father; for in their designs of mercy, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are *one*. Still he will, of right, dispense the blessing to all who receive it. For these were our Lord's true words: "To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but (or, except) it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father" (Matt. 20:23). The language logically implies our Lord's absolute right to give the crowns; but only to such as are appointed to these honors by the Father.

These ideas are repeated in vision to John. Jesus gives the "right to the tree of life" (Rev. 2:7). In the praises of the redeemed host, as described in that marvelous Apocalypse, they ever ascribe their salvation and glory to Jesus, and the sinless angels swell the chorus of Immanuel's praises, while the universe, from its myriad worlds, echoes the strain (Rev. 5:8-14).

In the description of the final state of things — a state which shall be subsequent to the millennium (Rev. 20:1-10), and also

to the final judgment of both righteous and wicked (Rev. 20:11-15), and to the act of homage and fealty described in I Cor. 15:24-28, we find the Lamb still and forever on the throne. The Church is still "the bride, the Lamb's wife" (Rev. 21:9). In that consummated state of all things, "The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it" (Rev. 21:22); the glory of God lightens it; "and the Lamb is the light thereof" (Rev. 21:23); the pure river of water of life still flows from beneath the throne of God and of the Lamb (Rev. 22:10), "the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him: and they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads" (Rev. 22:3, 4). Throughout the Apocalypse we never find Jesus among the worshipers. He is there the worshiped One on the throne, and with that picture the majestic vision closes.

The inspired Apostles had imbibed these ideas from the personal teaching of their Lord, and subsequent revelations did but expand in their minds the seed-thoughts which he had dropped there from his own sacred lips. Paul nobly expressed the sentiments of all his brethren when he wrote, "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing" (II Tim. 4:8). But surely he who claims supremacy, absolute and indisputable, in morals, in divine institutions, in the Church on earth, in heaven, and in a consummated universe forever, must be Lord of all, manifest in human form. If he were not, *what* must he have been to advance such assumptions, and what must the book be which enforces them?

4. *Jesus asserted his full possession of the power to forgive sins.* The moral instincts of the Jews were right when they put the question, "Who can forgive sins but God only?" (Mark 2:7). We do not wonder that, with their ideas of Christ, they asked in amazement, "Who is this that forgiveth sins also?" (Luke 7:49), or that they exclaimed, in reference to such a claim, from such a quarter, "This man blasphemeth" (Matt. 9:3).

And yet Christ declared most emphatically, on more than one occasion, his possession of this divine prerogative, and healed the palsied man in professed attestation of the fact (Luke 5:24). Those who would eliminate the miraculous element from the second

narrative altogether, must admit that Mathew, Mark, and Luke all relate most circumstantially that Jesus did at least profess to work a miracle in support of his claim to possess power to forgive sins. If he wrought the miracle, his claim is established; and if he did not work it, but cheated the people, then away with him forever as an arrant impostor! But if he wrought it, and proved his claim, he must be equal with his Father; for the Jews were right, and no one "can forgive sins but God only." Could a mere man cancel with a word the sin of a creature against his Maker? The very thought is a blasphemy.

5. *Jesus claimed the power to raise his own body from the grave, to quicken the souls of men into spiritual life, and to raise all the dead at the last great day.* Jesus likened his body to a temple which the Jews should destroy, and which he would raise up again in three days (John 2:19-21). He affirmed that he had power to lay down his life, and power to take it up again (John 10:18). He declared that the *spiritually* dead — for the physical resurrection is spoken of afterward as a distinct topic — should hear his voice and live (John 5:25). And then he tells us not to wonder at this, for the day is coming when, by his omnific fiat, all the generations of the dead "Shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation" (John 5:28, 29).

But if Jesus were not, in some mysterious sense, the Lord of his own life, what power had he to dispose of it as he pleased? And how could he recall it when gone? And how could he communicate spiritual life, if he were not its Divine Fountain? And how could he raise the dead from their graves, if he were not the Almighty Creator? All these claims, if genuine, necessitate faith in the God-head of Jesus.

6. *Jesus declared that he had the ability to do all his Father's works.* The Saviour had healed the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath day. When accused by the Jews of sin for this act, our Lord justified himself by the ever-memorable words, "My Father worketh hitherto (that is, on the Sabbath day in sustaining and blessing the worlds), and I work" — on the same day, *therefore*, in healing the sick, — thus indirectly asserting his right to do all that his Father did, and, as the Jews put it,

claiming *such* a Sonship as made him "equal with God." But our Lord did not abate one iota of his claim. True, he admitted that, as the *Incarnate Mediator*, he had received his authority from the Father, but he declared that "What things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise" (John 5:17-19). Now, no language can overestimate the sublimity of this claim. Christ affirmed that he possessed full right and ability to do all that the Eternal Father had the right and ability to do. Was such language ever used by the most inspired or the most daring of mere mortals? We do not forget that our Lord was careful to declare that the Father had committed all judgment to him (John 5:22); but had he not himself been a partaker of the Godhead how could he, as the Incarnate One, have been qualified to be armed with the prerogative so vast? He who can do all the works of God must be God!

7. Jesus spake of himself as the greatest gift of infinite mercy. In his conversation with Nicodemus, Christ spake of himself in these terms: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16), by which our Lord evidently meant to convey the idea that the gift of the Son was the richest gift of divine love. Imagine a mere man to stand forward and proclaim himself the choicest gift of God's love to our race. What a monstrous exaggeration and egotism! If Christ be greater than all other divine gifts combined, must he not be the God-man? On the evangelical hypothesis such representations are seen to be neither bombast nor rhetorical exaggeration, but sober, solid truth; and we can say with Paul, without reserve: "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift" (II Cor. 9:15).

8. Jesus announced himself as the center of rest for the human soul. Who has not thrilled under the mighty spell of those mighty words: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light" (Matt. 11:28-30). In this invitation our Lord proclaims himself to be everything to the soul. We are to come to him, to take his

yoke upon us, and to learn of him. In receiving *him* we shall find rest unto our souls, for he will give us rest.

Now, God alone is the resting-place of the human spirit. In him, and in him only, can we find assured peace. But Jesus claims to be our rest. Must he not, then, be God Incarnate? And very noticeable is the fact that, in the same breath in which he speaks of himself in these august terms, he says: "I am meek and lowly in heart." But where were his meekness and lowliness in making such a claim, if he were simply a man like ourselves?

In the same spirit are those memorable passages in which this wonderful personage speaks of himself as our peace. "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you" (John 14:27). "These words have I spoken unto you, that in *me* ye might have peace" (John 16:33). Thus ever does the Lord concentrate our thoughts upon *himself*. But what must he be to be worthy of such supreme attention?

9. *Jesus permitted Thomas to adore him as his Lord and his God, and pronounced a blessing upon the faith thus displayed* (John 20:28). On this fact we quote the admirable comment of Dean Alford: "The Socinian view, that these words, '*my Lord and my God*,' are merely an exclamation, is refuted, (1) By the fact that no such exclamations were in use among the Jews. (2) By the *eipen auto* (he said to *him*, that is Christ). (3) By the impossibility of referring *ho Kurios mou*, my Lord, to another than Jesus (see verse 13). (4) By the New Testament usage of expressing the vocative by the nominative with an article. (5) By the utter psychological absurdity of such a supposition; that one just convinced of the presence of him whom he deeply loved, should, instead of addressing him, break out into an irrelevant cry. (6) By the further absurdity of supposing that if such were the case, the Apostle John, who, of all the sacred writers, most constantly keeps in mind the object for which he is writing, should have recorded anything so beside that object. (7) By the intimate connection of *pepisteukas*, *thou hast believed* (see next verse).

"Dismissing it, therefore, we observe that this is the *highest confession* of faith which has yet been made; and that it shows that (though not yet fully) the meaning of the previous confessions of

his being '*the Son of God*' was understood. Thus John, in the very close of his Gospel iterates the testimony with which he began it — to the Godhead of the Word who became flesh, and, by this closing confession, shows how *the testimony of Jesus to himself* had gradually deepened and exalted the apostles' conviction, from the time when they knew him only as *ho huios tou Ioseph* (1:46), 'the son of Joseph,' till now, when he is acknowledged as their Lord and their God" (cf. Alford's *Greek New Testament* on the passage).

These judicious remarks leave nothing to be added as to the real application of the words, "my Lord and my God." But how did the Saviour *receive* this act of adoration? He commended it, and held it up for the imitation of the coming ages. "Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (29). He thus most emphatically declared his Lordship and Godhead. But how fearful was his crime in so doing, if he was only a Socinian Christ!

10. *Jesus demands of us an unhesitating and unlimited faith in himself; such faith, in short, as we should only exercise in God.* We are to believe in him for the salvation of our entire being; not merely as pointing out to us the way to heaven, but as being *himself* the way. He puts faith in him in the same category as faith in the Father (John 14:1). The spirit of his teaching about the faith to be reposed in him is given in his words to the woman of Samaria: "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith unto thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life" (John 4:10-14). Unless we exercise faith in his person and work, figuratively called eating his flesh and drinking his blood, we have no life in us (John 6:53); but if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever (51). Those who have given themselves up into the arms of Christ by faith receive eternal life from him, and shall never perish (John 10:28). They are as much in the arms of Jesus as in the arms of the Father; and their safety is as much secured by one as by the other (cf. 28,

29, 30). In fact, in this gracious transaction the Son and the Father are one (30). Well might the Jews, with their views of his origin, take up stones to stone him for these claims, saying as they did it, "We stone thee for blasphemy, because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God" (33). Our Lord's vindication of himself, by a reference to the language of Psalm 82:6, is an illustration of the *argument from the less to the greater*. If in *any* sense the Jewish rulers might be called gods, how much more properly might *he*, the only begotten Son of the Father, be so designated? "Without me ye can do nothing," is in short the essence of the Saviour's teaching about himself (see John 15:1-5).

This is the sum of the Gospel message: Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and ye shall be saved. It was a demand repeatedly and earnestly pressed by the Saviour, and inculcated by his apostles; and we say deliberately, that to exercise such a faith in Jesus as he required and the Gospel enforces, would, *with Socinian views*, be to expose ourselves to the terrible anathema: "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and that maketh flesh his arm" (Jer. 17:5). How could my soul be safe in the arms of a mere man? How dare I trust my eternal redemption to the care of such a Christ? And on what principle did Paul say: "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me" (Phil. 4:13). And how can Jesus be "All in all" to true believers of every nation? (Col. 3:11).

11. *The affection and devotion which Jesus demands, are such as can be properly yielded only to God.* As we are to trust Christ for everything, so we are to give up everything for him, should he demand the sacrifice. This was a doctrine which the Lord repeatedly taught. Let our readers study Matt. 10:37-39, and the parallel passage, Luke 14:26, 27, and they will see at once how uncompromising is the Saviour's demand. Father, mother, son, daughter, wife, and even life itself are all to be sacrificed, if devotion to Christ necessitates the surrender. All creatures, and all things, and our very lives are to be to us as nothing when compared with Christ. God himself demands no less of us, and no more. What *more could* the Eternal Creator require? The moral law says: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and him only shalt thou serve." But Christ bids us love *him* thus, and demands of us the homage

and sacrifice of our whole being; now, if he be not the *Author* of our being, what right has he to urge such a demand upon us? I could not love Christ as he requires to be loved, if I did not believe in him as the Incarnate God. To do so with Socinian views would be idolatry. Yet the motives which reigned in the hearts of inspired apostles are summed up in this one: "The love of Christ constraineth us," and they laid down the law, that all men are henceforth to live "not to themselves, but to him who died for them and rose again" (II Cor. 5:14, 15). And Jesus declared that our eternal destiny will take its character from our compliance or non-compliance with his demands: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father who is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 10:32, 33, 38-42, cf. Matt. 25:45, 46), and the sentiment is echoed in apostolical teaching, the language of which is, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha" (I Cor. 16:22). But clearly the suspension of such tremendous issues on the decree of our love for the person of a mere creature, is an idea utterly revolting to our moral sense. He must be the God-man.

12. *Very suggestive, too, are those passages in which Jesus promised his continued presence to his disciples after his ascension.* Beautiful are the words: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20). One of the last promises of our Lord was, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:20). No perverse criticism can explain away these assurances; they guarantee the perpetual, personal presence of Jesus with all his disciples to the end of time.

And this idea had a wonderful influence over the thoughts and actions of the men whom Jesus inspired. They lived as those who were perpetually under their Lord's eye. Thus one speaks in the name of all: "Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent (from Christ as to his bodily presence, see 6 and 8), we may be accepted of him (Christ)" (II Cor. 5:9). Though denied his bodily presence, his divine they knew to be ever with them, hence they labored to please him, and the best wish they could

breathe for each other was, "The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit" (II Tim. 4:22). And John saw him in vision ever holding the ministerial stars in his right hand, and walking in the midst of the golden lamps — the churches (Rev. 2:1).

But how can we explain such representations as these, if Messiah be possessed of but one nature — the human, which must of necessity be local and limited as to its presence? Who is this that is always with his disciples in all countries at the same moment, but the Infinite One in a human form? We feel his presence; we know he is with us; and in this fact we have evidence that he is more than a man.

Some who reject the idea of the deity of Christ find solace in such passages as "My Father is greater than I" (John 14:28). No one denies that, as man and mediator, our Lord was inferior to the Father. Philippians 2:5-8 describes the process by which God the Son emptied himself of the voluntary exercise of his attributes in order to become man and die for us.

There are two classes of Scriptures relating to our Lord: the first, affirming his possession of a human nature, with all its innocent frailties and limitations; and second, ascribing to him a divine nature, possessed of the attributes of Godhood, performing divine work, and worthy of supreme honor and worship. Unitarians can only fairly explain one of these classes of Scriptures, the former; but Trinitarians can accept both classes, and expound them in their integrity and fullness. We do not stumble at evidences that Jesus was "bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh." We rejoice in him as in one "touched with a feeling of our infirmities"; but we have no need to refine away, by a subtle and unfair criticism, the ascription to his person of divine perfections and works.

The times demand of us a vigorous re-assertion of the old truths, which are the very foundations of the Gospel system. Humanity needs a Christ whom all can worship and adore. The mythical account of Strauss' "Leben Jesu"; the unreal and romantic Christ of Renan's "Vie de Jesus"; and even the merely human Christ of "Ecce Homo," can never work any deliverance in the earth. Such a Messiah does not meet the yearnings of fallen human nature. It does not answer the pressing query, "How shall man be just with God?" It supplies no effective or sufficient

agency for the regeneration of man's moral powers. It does not bring God down to us in our nature. Such a Christ we may criticise and admire, as we would Socrates, or Plato, or Milton, or Shakespeare; but we cannot trust him with our salvation; we cannot love him with all our hearts; we cannot pour forth at his feet the homage of our whole being; for to do so would be idolatry.

A so-called Saviour, whose only power to save lies in the excellent moral precepts that he gave, and the pure life that he lived; who is no longer the God-man, but the mere man; whose blood had no sacrificial atoning or propitiatory power in the moral government of Jehovah, but was simply a martyr's witness to a superior system of ethics — is not the Saviour of the four Gospels, or of Paul, or Peter, or John. It is not under the banners of such a Messiah that the Church of God has achieved its triumphs. The Christ of the New Testament, of the early Church, of universal Christendom; the Christ, the power of whose name has revolutionized the world and raised it to its present level, and under whose guidance the sacramental host of God's redeemed are advancing and shall advance to yet greater victories over superstition and sin, is Immanuel, God with us, in our nature, whose blood "cleanseth us from all sin," and who is "able to save, even to the uttermost, all that come unto God through him."

26

The Certainty and Importance of the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead

By Rev. R. A. Torrey, D.D.

Revised and edited by Gerald B. Stanton, Th.D.

The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is the cornerstone of Christian doctrine. It is mentioned directly one hundred and four or more times in the New Testament. It was the most prominent and cardinal point in the apostolic testimony. When the apostolic company, after the apostasy of Judas Iscariot, felt it necessary to complete their number again by the addition of one to take the place of Judas Iscariot, it was in order that he might "be a witness with us of his resurrection" (Acts 1:21, 22). The resurrection of Jesus Christ was the one point that Peter emphasized in his great sermon on the Day of Pentecost. His whole sermon centered in that fact. Its keynote was, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses" (Acts 2:32; cf. vs. 24-31). When the Apostles were filled again with the Holy Spirit some days later, the one central result was that "with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." The central doctrine that the Apostle Paul preached to the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers on Mars Hill was Jesus and the resurrection (Acts 17:18; cf. Acts 23:6; I Cor. 15:15).

The resurrection of Jesus Christ is one of the two fundamental truths of the Gospel, the other being his atoning death (I Cor. 15:1, 3, 4). This was the glad tidings, first, that Christ died for our sins, and second, that he arose again. The crucifixion loses its meaning without the resurrection. Without the resurrection, the death of Christ was only the heroic death of a noble martyr. With the resurrection, it is the atoning death of the Son of God. It shows that death to be of sufficient value to redeem us from all our sins, for it was the sacrifice of the Son of God. Disprove

the resurrection of Jesus Christ and Christian faith is vain. "If Christ be not risen," cries Paul, "then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain" (I Cor. 15:14). Later he adds, "If Christ be not risen, your faith is vain. You are yet in your sins." Paul, as the context clearly shows, is talking about the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ. The doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the one doctrine that has power to save any one who believes it with the heart (Rom. 10:9). To know the power of Christ's resurrection is one of the highest ambitions of the intelligent believer, to attain which he sacrifices all things and counts them but refuse (Phil. 3:8-10 ASV).

While the literal bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ is the cornerstone of Christian doctrine, it is also the Gibraltar of Christian evidence, and the Waterloo of infidelity and rationalism. If the scriptural assertions of Christ's resurrection can be established as historic certainties, the claims and doctrines of Christianity rest upon an impregnable foundation. On the other hand, if the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead cannot be established, Christianity must go. It is a true instinct that led a leading and brilliant agnostic in England to say, that there is no use wasting time discussing the other miracles. The essential question is, Did Jesus Christ rise from the dead? If he did, it was easy enough to believe the other miracles; but, if not, the other miracles must go.

Are the statements contained in the four Gospels regarding the resurrection of Jesus Christ statements of fact or are they fiction, fables, myths? There are three separate lines of proof that the statements contained in the four Gospels regarding the resurrection of Jesus Christ are exact statements of historic fact.

I. The External Evidence of the Authenticity and Truthfulness of the Gospel Narratives

This is an altogether satisfactory argument. The external proofs of the authenticity and truthfulness of the Gospel narratives are overwhelming, but the argument is long and intricate and it would take a volume to discuss it satisfactorily. The other arguments are so completely sufficient and overwhelming and convincing to a candid mind that we can pass this present argument by, good as it is in its place.

II. *The Internal Proofs of the Truthfulness of the Gospel Records*

This argument is thoroughly conclusive, and we shall state it briefly in the pages which follow. We will assume absolutely nothing. We will start out with a fact which we all know to be a fact, namely, that we have the four Gospels today, whoever wrote them and whenever they were written. We shall place these four Gospels side by side, and see if we can discern in them the marks of truth or of fiction.

1. The first thing that strikes us as we compare these Gospels one with another is that they are four separate and independent accounts. This appears plainly from the apparent discrepancies in the four different accounts, which are marked and many. It would have been impossible for these four to have been made up in collusion with one another, or to have been derived from one another, when so many and so marked differences are found in them. There is harmony between the four accounts, but the harmony does not lie upon the surface; it comes out only by protracted and thorough study. It is precisely such a harmony as would exist between accounts written by several different persons, each looking at the events from his own standpoint. It is precisely such a harmony as would not exist in four accounts manufactured in collusion, or derived one from the other. In four accounts manufactured in collusion, whatever of harmony there might be would appear on the surface. Whatever discrepancy there might be would only come out by minute and careful study. But with the four Gospels the case is just the opposite. Harmony comes out by minute and careful study, and the apparent discrepancy lies upon the surface. Whether true or false, these four accounts are separate and independent from one another. (The four accounts also supplement one another, the third account sometimes reconciling apparent discrepancies between two.)

These accounts must be either a record of facts that actually occurred or else fictions. If fictions, they must have been fabricated independently of one another; the agreements are too marked and too many. It is absolutely incredible that four persons sitting down to write an account of what never occurred independently of one another, should have made their stories agree to

the extent that these do. On the other hand, they cannot have been made up, as we have already seen, in collusion with one another; the apparent discrepancies are too numerous and too noticeable. It is proven they were not made up independently of one another; it is proven they were not made up in collusion with one another, so we are driven to the conclusion that they were not made up at all, that they are a true relation of facts as they actually occurred. We might rest the argument here and reasonably call the case settled, but we will go on still further.

2. The next thing we notice is that each of these accounts bears striking indications of having been derived from eye witnesses.

The account of an eyewitness is readily distinguishable from the account of one who is merely retelling what others have told him. Any one who is accustomed to weigh evidence in court or in historical study soon learns how to distinguish the report of an eye witness from mere hearsay evidence. Any careful student of the Gospel records of the resurrection will readily detect many marks of the eye witness. Some years ago when lecturing at an American university, a gentleman was introduced to me as being a skeptic. I asked him, "What line of study are you pursuing?" He replied that he was pursuing a postgraduate course in history with a view to a professorship in history. I said, "Then you know that the account of an eye witness differs in marked respects from the account of one who is simply telling what he has heard from others?" "Yes," he replied. I next asked, "Have you carefully read the four Gospel accounts of the resurrection of Christ?" He replied, "I have." "Tell me, have you noticed clear indications that they were derived from eye witnesses?" "Yes," he replied, "I have been greatly struck by this in reading the accounts." Any one who carefully and intelligently reads them will be struck with the same fact.

3. The third thing that we notice about these Gospel narratives is their naturalness, straightforwardness, artlessness and simplicity.

The accounts it is true, have to do with the supernatural, but the accounts themselves are most natural. There is a remarkable absence of all attempt at coloring and effect. There is nothing but

the simple, straightforward telling of facts as they actually occurred. Dr. William Furness, the great Unitarian scholar and critic, who certainly was not over-much disposed in favor of the supernatural, says, "Nothing can exceed in artlessness and simplicity the four accounts of the first appearance of Jesus after his crucifixion. If these qualities are not discernible here, we must despair of ever being able to discern them anywhere."

Suppose we should find four accounts of the Battle of Monmouth. We found them all marked by that artlessness, straightforwardness and simplicity that always carries conviction; we found that, while apparently disagreeing in minor details, they agreed substantially in their account of the battle — even though we had no knowledge of the authorship or date of these accounts, would we not, in the absence of any other accounts, say, "Here is a true account of the Battle of Monmouth?" Now this is exactly the case with the four Gospel narratives. Manifestly separate and independent from one another, bearing the clear marks of having been derived from eye witnesses, characterized by an unparalleled artlessness, simplicity and straightforwardness, apparently disagreeing in minor details, but in perfect agreement as to the great central facts related. If we are fair and honest, if we follow the canons of evidence followed in court, if we follow any sound and sane law of literary and historical criticism, are we not logically driven to say, "Here is a true account of the resurrection of Jesus"?

4. The next thing we notice is the unintentional evidence of words, phrases, and accidental details.

It oftentimes happens that when a witness is on the stand, the unintentional evidence that he bears by words and phrases which he uses, and by accidental details which he introduces, is more convincing than his direct testimony of the truth to itself. The Gospel accounts abound in evidence of this sort.

Take, as the first instance, the fact that in all the Gospel records of the resurrection, we are given to understand that Jesus was not at first recognized by his disciples when he appeared to them after his resurrection (e.g., Luke 24:16; John 21:4). The Gospel narratives simply record the fact without attempting to explain it. If the stories were fictitious, they certainly would never have been

made up in this way, for the writer would have seen at once the objection that would arise in the minds of those who did not wish to believe in his resurrection, that is, that it was not really Jesus whom the disciples saw. Why, then, is the story told in this way? For the self-evident reason that the evangelists were not making up a story for effect, but simply recording events precisely as they occurred. This is the way in which it occurred, therefore, this is the way in which they told it. It is not a fabrication of imaginary incidents, but an exact record of facts carefully observed and accurately recorded.

Take a second instance: In all the Gospel records of the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection, there is not a single recorded appearance to an enemy or opponent of Christ. All his appearances were to those who were already believers. Why this was so we can easily see by little thought, but nowhere in the Gospels are we told why it was so. If the stories had been fabricated, they certainly would never have been made up in this way. If the Gospels were, as some would have us believe, fabrications constructed one hundred, two hundred, or three hundred years after the alleged events recorded, when all the actors were dead and gone and no one could gainsay any lies told, Jesus would have been represented as appearing to Caiaphas, and Annas, and Pilate, and Herod, and confounding them by his reappearance from the dead. But there is no suggestion of anything of this kind in the Gospel stories. Every appearance is to one who is already a believer. Why is this so? For the self-evident reason that this was the way that things occurred, and the Gospel narratives are not concerned with producing a story for effect, but simply with recording events precisely as they occurred and as they were observed.

We find another very striking instance in what is recorded concerning the words of Jesus to Mary at their first meeting (John 20:17). Jesus is recorded as saying to Mary, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." We are not told why Jesus said this to Mary. We are left to discover the reason for it, and the explanations vary widely one from another. Why then is this little utterance of Jesus put in the Gospel record without a word of explanation? Certainly a writer making up a

story would not put in a detail like that without apparent meaning and without an attempt at an explanation of it. Why then do we find it here? Because this is exactly what happened. This is what Jesus said; this is what Mary heard Jesus say; this is what Mary told, and therefore this is what John recorded. We cannot have a fiction here, but an accurate record of words spoken by Jesus after his resurrection.

We find still another instance in John 20:4-6. This is all in striking keeping with what we know of John and Peter from other sources. Mary, returning hurriedly from the tomb, bursts in upon the two disciples and cries, "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him." The men sprang to their feet and ran at the top of their speed to the tomb. John, the younger of the two disciples (it is all the more striking that the narrative does not tell us here that he was the younger of the two disciples) was fleet of foot and outran Peter and reached the tomb first, but man of retiring and reverent disposition that he was (we are not told this here but we know it from a study of his personality as revealed elsewhere) he did not enter the tomb, but simply stooped down and looked in. Impetuous but older Peter comes lumbering on behind as fast as he can, but when once he reaches the tomb, he never waits a moment outside but plunges headlong in. Is this made up, or is it life? He was indeed a literary artist of consummate ability who had the skill to make this up if it did not occur just so. There is incidentally a touch of local coloring in the report. When one visits today the tomb which scholars now accept as the real burial place of Jesus, he will find himself unconsciously obliged to stoop down in order to look in.

We find another instance in Mark 16:7: "But go your way, tell his disciples *and Peter* that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you." What I would have you notice here are the two words, "*and Peter*." Was not Peter one of the disciples? Why then, "*and Peter*"? No explanation is given in the text, but reflection shows it was the utterance of love toward the despondent, despairing disciple who had thrice denied his Lord. If the message had been simply to the disciples Peter would have said, "Yes, I was once a disciple, but I can

no longer be counted such. I thrice denied my Lord on that awful night with oaths and curses. It does not mean me." But our tender compassionate Lord through his angelic messenger sends the message, "Go tell his disciples, and whoever you tell, be sure you tell poor, weak, faltering, backslidden, broken-hearted Peter." Is this made up, or is this a real picture of our Lord? I pity the man who is so dull that he can imagine this is fiction. Incidentally let it be noted that this is recorded only in the Gospel of Mark, which, as is well known, is Peter's Gospel. As Peter narrated to Mark one day what he should record, with tearful eyes and grateful heart he would turn to him and say, "Mark, be sure you put that in, 'Tell his disciples *and Peter*.'"

Take still another instance: In John 20:16 we read, "Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master." What a delicate touch of nature we have here! Mary is standing outside the tomb overcome with grief. She has not recognized her Lord, though he has spoken to her. She has mistaken him for the gardner. She has said, "Sir, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." Then Jesus utters just one word. He said, "Mary." As that name came trembling on the morning air, uttered with the old familiar tone, spoken as no one else had ever spoken it but he, in an instant her eyes were opened. She falls at his feet and tries to clasp them, and looks up into his face, and cries, "Rabboni, my Master." Is this made up? Impossible! This is life. This is Jesus, and this is the woman who loved him. No unknown author of the second, third, or fourth century could have produced such a masterpiece as this. We stand here unquestionably face to face with reality, with life, with Jesus and Mary as they actually were.

One more important illustration: In John 20:7 we read, "And the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself." How strange that such a little detail as this should be added to the story with absolutely no attempt at explaining. But how deeply significant this little unexplained detail is. Recall the circumstances. Jesus is dead. For three days and three nights his body is lying cold and silent in the sepulchre, as truly dead as any body was ever dead,

but at last the appointed hour has come, the breath of God sweeps through the sleeping and silent clay, and in that supreme moment of his own earthly life, that supreme moment of human history, when Jesus rises triumphant over death and the grave and Satan, there is no excitement upon his part, but with that same majestic self-composure and serenity that marked his whole career, that same divine calm that he displayed upon storm-tossed Galilee, so now again in this sublime, this awful moment, he does not excitedly tear the napkin from his face and fling it aside, but absolutely without human haste or flurry or disorder, he unties it calmly from his head, rolls it up and lays it away in an orderly manner in a place by itself. Was that made up? Never! We do not behold here an exquisite masterpiece of the romancer's art; we read here the simple narrative of a matchless detail in a unique life that was actually lived here upon earth, a life so beautiful that one cannot read it with an honest and open mind without feeling the tears coming into his eyes.

But some one will say, all these things are little things. True, and it is from that very fact that they gain much of their significance. It is just in such little things that fiction would disclose itself. Fiction displays itself to be different from fact in the minute; in the great outstanding outlines you can make fiction look like truth, but when you come to examine it minutely and microscopically, you will soon detect that it is not reality but fabrication. But the more microscopically we examine the Gospel narratives, the more we become impressed with their truthfulness. There is an artlessness and naturalness and self-evident truthfulness in the narratives, down to the minutest detail, that surpasses all the possibilities of art.

The third line of proof that the statements contained in the four Gospels regarding the resurrection of Jesus Christ are exact statements of historic fact, is

III. The Circumstantial Evidence for the Resurrection of Christ

There are certain proven and admitted facts that demand the resurrection of Christ to account for them.

1. Beyond a question, the foundation truth preached in the early years of the Church's history was the resurrection.

Whether Jesus did actually rise from the dead or not, it is certain that the one thing the apostles constantly proclaimed was that he had risen. Why should the apostles use this as the very cornerstone of their creed, if not well attested and firmly believed?

But this is not all: They laid down their lives for this doctrine. Men never lay down their lives for a doctrine which they do not firmly believe. They stated that they had seen Jesus after his resurrection, and rather than give up their statement, they laid down their lives for it. Of course, men may die for error and often have, but it was for error that they firmly believed. In this case they would have known whether they had seen Jesus or not, and they would not merely have been dying for error but dying for a statement which they knew to be false. This is not only incredible but impossible. Furthermore, if the apostles really firmly believed, as is admitted, that Jesus rose from the dead, they had some facts upon which they founded their belief. These would have been the facts that they would have related in recounting the story. They certainly would not have made up a story out of imaginary incidents when they had real facts upon which they founded their belief. But if the facts were as recounted in the Gospels, there is no possible escaping the conclusion that Jesus actually arose. Still further, if Jesus had not arisen, there would have been evidence that he had not. His enemies would have sought and found this evidence, but the apostles went up and down the very city where he had been crucified and proclaimed right to the faces of his slayers that he had been raised, and no one could produce evidence to the contrary. The very best they could do was to say the guards went to sleep and the disciples stole the body while the guards slept. Men who bear evidence of what happens while they are asleep are not usually regarded as credible witnesses. Further still, if the Apostles had stolen the body, they would have known it themselves and would not have been ready to die for what they knew to be a fraud.

2. Another known fact is the change in the day of rest. The early Church came from among the Jews. From time immemorial the Jews had celebrated the seventh day of the week as their day of rest and worship, but we find the early Christians in the

Acts of the Apostles, and also in early Christian writings, assembling on the first day of the week. Nothing is more difficult of accomplishment than the change in a holy day that has been celebrated for centuries and is one of the most cherished customs of the people. What is especially significant about the change is that it was changed by no express decree but by general consent. Something tremendous must have occurred that led to this change. The apostles asserted that what had occurred on that day was the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and that is the most rational explanation. In fact, it is the only reasonable explanation of the change.

3. But the most significant fact of all is the change in the disciples themselves, the moral transformation. At the time of the crucifixion of Christ, we find the whole apostolic company filled with blank and utter despair. We see Peter, the leader of the apostolic company, denying his Lord three times with oaths and cursings, but a few days later we see this same man, filled with a courage that nothing could shake. We see him standing before the council that had condemned Jesus to death and saying to them, "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand before you whole" (Acts 4:10). A little further on when commanded by the council not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus, we hear Peter and John answering, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (Acts 4:19, 20). A little later still after arrest and imprisonment, in peril of death, when sternly arraigned by the council, we hear Peter and the apostles answering their demand that they should be silent regarding Jesus, with the words, "We ought to obey God rather than man. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. And we are his witnesses of these things" (Acts 5:29-32). Something tremendous must have occurred to account for such a radical and astounding moral transformation as this. Nothing short of the

fact of the resurrection and of their having seen the risen Lord will explain it.

These unquestionable facts are so impressive and so conclusive that even infidel and Jewish scholars now admit that the apostles believed that Jesus rose from the dead. Even Ferdinand Baur, father of the Tübingen School, admitted this. David Strauss, who wrote the most masterly "Life of Jesus" from the rationalistic standpoint that was ever written, said, "Only this much need be acknowledged that the apostles firmly believed that Jesus had arisen." Strauss evidently did not wish to admit any more than he had to, but he felt compelled to admit this much. Schenkel went even further and said, "It is an indisputable fact that in the early morning of the first day of the week following the crucifixion, the grave of Jesus was found empty. It is a second fact that the disciples and other members of the apostolic communion were convinced that Jesus was seen after the crucifixion." These admissions are fatal to the rationalists who make them. The question at once arises, "Whence these convictions and belief, if not from a literal resurrection?"

Renan attempted an answer by saying that "the passion of a hallucinated woman (Mary) gives to the world a resurrected God." (Renan, *Life of Jesus*, p. 357). By this, Renan means that Mary was in love with Jesus; that after his crucifixion, brooding over it, in the passion of her love, she dreamed herself into a condition where she had a hallucination that she had seen Jesus risen from the dead. She reported her dream as a fact, and thus the passion of a hallucinated woman gave to the world a resurrected God. But the reply to all this is self-evident, namely, the passion of a hallucinated woman was not competent to this task. Remember the makeup of the apostolic company; in the apostolic company were a Matthew and a Thomas to be convinced, outside was a Saul of Tarsus to be converted. The passion of a hallucinated woman will not convince a stubborn unbeliever like Thomas, nor a Jewish tax-gatherer like Matthew. Whoever heard of a tax-gatherer, and most of all of a Jewish tax-gatherer, who could be imposed upon by the passion of a hallucinated woman? Neither will the passion of a hallucinated woman convince a fierce and conscientious enemy like Saul of Tarsus. We must look

for some saner explanation than this. Strauss tried to account for it by inquiring whether the appearance might not have been visionary. Strauss has had, and still has, many followers in this theory. But to this we reply, first of all, there was no subjective starting point for such visions. The apostles, so far from expecting to see the Lord, would scarcely believe their own eyes when they did see him. Furthermore, whoever heard of eleven men having the same vision at the same time, to say nothing of five hundred men (I Cor. 15:6) having the same vision at the same time. Strauss demands of us that we give up one reasonable miracle and substitute five hundred impossible miracles in its place. Nothing can surpass the credulity of unbelief.

The third attempt at an explanation is that Jesus was not really dead when they took him from the cross, that his friends worked over him and brought him back to life, and what was supposed to be the appearance of the raised Lord was the appearance of one who never had been really dead and was now merely resuscitated. This theory of Paulus has been brought forward and revamped by various rationalistic writers in our own time and seems to be a favorite theory of those who today would deny the reality of our Lord's resurrection. To sustain this view, appeal has been made to the short time Jesus hung upon the cross, and to the fact that history tells us of one in the time of Josephus taken down from the cross and nursed back to life. But to this we answer: Remember the events preceding the crucifixion, the agony in the garden of Gethsemane, the awful ordeal of the four trials, the scourging and the consequent physical condition in which all this left Jesus. Remember, too, the water and the blood that poured from his pierced side. In the second place, his enemies would have taken, and did take, all necessary precautions against such a thing as this happening (John 19:34). In the third place, if Jesus had been merely resuscitated, he would have been so weak, such an utter physical wreck, that his reappearance would have been measured at its real value, and the moral transformation in the disciples would still remain unaccounted for. In the fourth place, if brought back to life, the apostles and friends of Jesus, who are the ones who are supposed to have brought him back to life, would have known that it was not a case of resurrection but of resuscitation,

and the main fact to be accounted for, namely, the change in themselves would remain unaccounted for. The attempted explanation is an explanation that does not explain. In the fifth place, we reply, that the moral difficulty is the greatest of all, for if it was really a case of resuscitation, then Jesus tried to palm himself off as one risen from the dead, when in reality he was nothing of the sort. In that case, he would be an arch-impostor, and the whole Christian system rests on a fraud as its ultimate foundation. Is it possible to believe that such a system of religion as that of Jesus Christ, embodying such exalted principles and precepts of truth, purity, and love, "originated in a deliberately planned fraud"? No one whose own heart is not cankered by fraud and trickery can believe Jesus to have been an impostor, and his religion to have been founded upon fraud.

A leader of the rationalistic forces in England has recently tried to prove the theory that Jesus was only apparently dead by appealing to the fact that when the side of Jesus was pierced blood came forth and asks, "Can a dead man bleed?" To this the sufficient reply is that when a man dies of what is called in popular language, a broken heart, the blood escapes into the pericardium, and after standing there for a short time it separates into serum (the water) and clot (the red corpuscles, blood), and thus if a man were dead, if his side were pierced by a spear, and the point of the spear entered the pericardium, "blood and water" would flow out just as the record states it did. What is brought forth as a proof that Jesus was not really dead, is in reality a proof that he was, and an illustration of the minute accuracy of the story. It could not have been made up in this way, if it were not actual fact.

We have eliminated all other possible suppositions. We have but one left, namely, Jesus really was raised from the dead the third day as recorded in the four Gospels. The desperate straits to which those who attempt to deny it are driven are themselves proof of the fact.

We have then several independent lines of argument pointing decisively and conclusively to the resurrection of Christ from the dead. Some of them taken separately prove the fact, but taken together they constitute an argument that makes doubt of the

resurrection of Christ impossible to the candid mind. Of course, if one is determined not to believe, no amount of proof will convince him. Such a man must be left to his own deliberate choice of error and falsehood; but any man who really desires to know the truth and is willing to obey it at any cost must accept the resurrection of Christ as an historically proven fact.

27

The Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit

By R. A. Torrey, D.D.

Formerly Dean, The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Inc.

Revised and edited by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

Importance of the Doctrine

One of the most distinctive doctrines of the Christian faith is that of the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit. It is of the highest importance from the standpoint of worship. If the Holy Spirit is a divine Person, worthy to receive our adoration, our faith, and our love, and we do not know and recognize him as such, then we are robbing a divine Being of the adoration and love and confidence which are his due.

The doctrine of the personality of the Holy Spirit is also of the highest importance from the practical standpoint. If we think of the Holy Spirit only as an impersonal power or influence, then our thought will constantly be, "How can I get hold of and use the Holy Spirit"; but if we think of him in the biblical way as a divine Person, infinitely wise infinitely holy, infinitely tender, then our thought will constantly be, "How can the Holy Spirit get hold of and use me?" The former conception leads to self-exaltation; the latter to self-humiliation, self-emptying, and self-renunciation. If we think of the Holy Spirit merely as a divine power or influence, and then imagine that we have received the Holy Spirit, there will be the temptation to feel as if we belonged to a superior order of Christians. But if we think of the Holy Spirit in the biblical way as a divine Being of infinite majesty, condescending to dwell in our hearts and take possession of our lives, it will put us in the dust, and make us walk very softly before God.

It is of the highest importance from an experimental standpoint that we know the Holy Spirit as a person. Many can testify of

the blessing that has come into their own lives from coming to know the Holy Spirit, as an ever-present, living, divine friend and helper. There are four lines of proof in the Bible that the Holy Spirit is a person.

Characteristics of the Holy Spirit

1. All the distinctive characteristics of personality are ascribed to the Holy Spirit. What are the distinctive marks of personality? Knowledge, feeling, and will. Any being who knows and feels and wills is a person. When you say that the Holy Spirit is a person, some understand you to mean that the Holy Spirit has hands, feet, eyes, and so on, but these are marks, not of personality, but of corporeity. When we say that the Holy Spirit is a person, we mean that he is not a mere influence or power that God sends into our lives, but that he is a Being who knows, feels, and wills. These three characteristics of personality, knowledge, feeling, and will, are ascribed to the Holy Spirit over and over again.

In I Corinthians 2:10, 11 knowledge is ascribed to the Holy Spirit. He is not merely an illumination that comes into our minds, but he is a being who himself knows the deep things of God, teaching us what he himself knows. Will is ascribed to the Holy Spirit in I Corinthians 12:11 (ASV). The Holy Spirit is not a mere influence or power which we are to use according to our wills, but a divine Person who uses us according to his will. This is a truth of fundamental importance in getting into right relation with the Holy Spirit. We read in Romans 8:27 that the quality of mind is attributed to the Holy Spirit. "Mind" includes the ideas of thought, feeling, and purpose. Thus, personality in the fullest sense is ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

In Romans 15:30 love is stated as an attribute of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is not a mere blind, unfeeling influence or power that comes into our lives. The Holy Spirit is a person who loves as tenderly as God the Father or Jesus Christ the Son. We think daily of the love of God the Father and of Christ the Son, but very few meditate as we ought upon the love of the Holy Spirit. Yet we owe our salvation just as truly to the love of the Spirit, as we do to the love of the Father and the love of the Son. Again,

we read in Nehemiah 9:20 (ASV) that intelligence and goodness are characteristics of the Holy Spirit. There are those who tell us that the personality of the Holy Spirit is not found in the Old Testament. While this truth is not so fully developed as in the New Testament, nonetheless the basic concept is there also. Finally, Ephesians 4:30 attributes grief to the Holy Spirit. He is a person who comes to dwell in our hearts, observing all that we do, say, and think. If there is anything in act, word, or thought that is impure, unkind, selfish, or evil in any way, he is deeply grieved by it. This thought once fully comprehended becomes one of the strongest motives to a holy life and careful walk.

The Acts of the Spirit

2. The second line of proof in the Bible of the personality of the Holy Spirit is that many acts that only a person can perform are ascribed to the Holy Spirit. I Corinthians 2:10 states that the Spirit searches the deep things of God. He is not merely an illumination, but a person who searches into the deep things of God. In Revelation 2:7 he is represented as speaking; Galatians 4:6 declares he cries out. Romans 8:26 is proof of the praying ministry of the Spirit. It is not only that he teaches us to pray, but he personally prays in and through us. The believer has Christ praying for him at the right hand of the Father (Heb. 7:25), and the Holy Spirit praying through him here (Rom. 8:26).

In John 15:26, 27; 14:26; and 16:12-14 the Holy Spirit is set forth as a teacher of the truth, not merely an illumination that enables our mind to see the truth, but one who personally comes to us and teaches us the truth. It is the privilege of the humblest believer to have this divine Person as his daily teacher of the truth of God (I John 2:20, 27). The Holy Spirit is represented in Romans 8:14 as our personal guide, directing us what to do, taking us by the hand, as it were, and leading us into that line of action that is well-pleasing to God. From Acts 16:6, 7; 13:2; and 20:28 we learn that the Holy Spirit takes command of the life and conduct of a servant of Jesus Christ; he is also seen calling men to work and appointing them to office. Repeatedly in the Scriptures actions are ascribed to the Holy Spirit which only a person could perform.

The Office of the Spirit

3. The third line of proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit is that an office is predicated to the Holy Spirit that could only be predicated of a person. In John 14:16, 17 we are told it is the office of the Spirit to be another Comforter to take the place of our absent Savior. Christ promised that during his absence he would not leave the disciples orphaned (John 14:18). Is it possible that Jesus should have promised another Comforter to take his place, if that One was not a person, but only an influence or power, no matter how beneficent and divine? Still further is it conceivable that he would have said it was expedient for him to go away (John 16:7), if the other Comforter that was coming to take his place was only an influence or power? Moreover, the Greek word "Paraclete" connotes one who is constantly at the side as helper, counselor, comforter, friend. This demands personality. While we await Christ's return from the throne of the Father, we have another Person just as divine as he, just as wise, just as strong, just as able to help, just as loving, always by our side ready at any moment that we look to him, to counsel us, to teach us, to give us victory to take the entire control of our lives.

This is one of the most comforting thoughts in the New Testament for this dispensation. It is a cure for loneliness. It is a cure for breaking hearts, separated from loved ones. It is a cure from the fear of darkness and danger. But it is in our service for Christ that this thought of the Holy Spirit comes to us with greatest helpfulness. We need not be robbed of joy and liberty in our service because fear hampers our efforts. We need only remember that the responsibility is not really upon us but upon another, the Holy Spirit, and he knows just what ought to be done and what ought to be said. If he is permitted to do the work which he is so perfectly competent to do, our fears and cares will vanish.

Treatment of the Holy Spirit

4. The fourth line of proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit is: a treatment is predicated of the Holy Spirit that could only be predicated of a person. The Holy Spirit can be opposed, resisted and grieved, according to Isaiah 63:10 (ASV). You

cannot rebel against an influence or power. You can only rebel against and grieve a person. You can only treat a person with contumely, and this is stated with reference to the Holy Spirit (Heb. 10:29). Ananias and Sapphira lied to the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:3). You cannot tell lies to a blind, impersonal influence or power, but only to a person. Matthew 12:31, 32 states that the Holy Spirit may be blasphemed. It is impossible to blaspheme an influence or power; only a person can be blasphemed, and a divine Person at that. We are still further told that the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit is a more serious sin than even the blasphemy of the Son of man himself. Could anything make more clear that the Holy Spirit is a person and a divine Person?

Summary

To summarize, the Holy Spirit is a person. The Scriptures make this plain beyond a question to anyone who candidly goes to the Scriptures to find out what they really teach. Do we walk in conscious fellowship with him? Do we realize that he is our constant Indweller? Do we know the communion of the Holy Spirit (II Cor. 13:14)? Herein lies the secret of a Christian life of liberty, joy, power and fullness. To have as one's ever-present friend, and to be conscious that one has as his ever-present friend, the Holy Spirit, and to surrender one's life in all its departments entirely to his control, this is true Christian living.

28

The Holy Spirit and the Sons of God

By Rev. W. J. Erdman, D.D.

Germantown, Pennsylvania

Revised and edited by Charles L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D.

It is evident from many writings on the baptism of the Holy Spirit that due importance has not been given to the peculiar characteristic of the gift of Pentecost in its relation to the sonship of believers. Before considering this subject a few brief remarks may be made concerning the Holy Spirit and his relation to the people of God in the dispensations and times preceding the Day of Pentecost.

1. The Holy Spirit is another Person of the Godhead, but not a different Being. To him as a personal Being are ascribed names, affections, words, and acts, interchanged with those of God. His acts and dealings are not those of an impersonal medium or influence, but of a person, and One who in the nature of the case cannot be less than God in wisdom, love, and power, who is one with the Father and the Son. He is another Person, indeed, but not a different Being.

2. The spiritual, divine life in the people of God is the same in kind in every age and dispensation, but the relation to God in which the life was developed of old was different from that which now exists between believers as sons and God as Father. In accordance with that relationship the Holy Spirit acted. He was of old the author and nourisher of all spiritual life and power in righteous men and women of past ages, in patriarch and friend of God, in Israelites as minors and servants, in pious kings and adoring psalmists, in consecrated priests and faithful prophets. Whatever truth had been revealed, he employed to develop the divine life he had imparted. From the beginning he used promise and precept, law and type, psalm and ritual to instruct,

quicken, convince, teach, lead, warn, comfort, and promote the growth and establishment of the people of God.

When at last all righteousness and holy virtues appeared in Christ, then the mold and image of the spiritual life of the saints of the old covenant was seen perfect and complete. In ways Godward and manward, in self-denial and in full surrender to his Father's will, in hatred of sin and in grace to sinners, in purity of heart and forgiveness of injuries, in gentleness and all condescension, in restful yet ceaseless service, in unity of purpose and faultless obedience — in a word, in all excellencies and graces, in all virtues and beauties of the Spirit, in light and in love, the Lord Jesus set forth the mold and substance of the life spiritual, divine, eternal.

3. Redemption precedes sonship and the gift of the Spirit. This proposition is clearly seen in Paul's argument in Galatians 4:4-6. The word "adoption" signifies the placing in the state and relation of a son (Rom. 9:4 and Eph. 1:5). In the writings of John believers are never called sons, but "children" ("born ones"), a word indicating nature, kinship. Sonship relates not to nature, but to legal standing; it is associated not with regeneration, but with redemption. It was on the redeemed disciples that the Spirit of God was poured at Pentecost, not to make believers sons, but because they had become sons through redemption. In brief, sonship, though ever since redemption inseparable from justification, does in the order of salvation succeed justification.

Through redemption the new dignity of sonship was conferred, the new name "sons" was given to them as a new name "Father" had been declared of him. A new name was given to the life in this new relation, "the life eternal," and a new name, "Spirit of his Son," was given to the Holy Spirit, who henceforth would nourish and develop this life, and illumine and lead believers into all the privileges and duties of the sons of God.

These facts are then all related to and dependent upon each other. Jesus Christ must first lay the ground of the forgiveness of sins of past and future times in his work of redemption and reconciliation; as risen and glorified not before, he is "the first-born of many brethren," to whose image they are prede-

tined to be conformed. As the Son, he declared to them the name of God as Father, the crowning name of God corresponding to their highest name, sons of God. As his brethren in this high and peculiar sense, he did not call them until he had first suffered, died, and risen again from the dead, but that name is the first word he spoke of them on the morning of the resurrection, as if it were the chiefest joy of his soul to name and greet them as his brethren, and sons of God, being in and with him "sons of the resurrection." Because they were sons, the Father through the Son sent forth the Spirit of his Son into their hearts, crying, "Abba, Father!" It is the marvelous dignity of a sonship in glory, like that of our Lord Jesus, with all its attendant blessings and privileges, services and rewards, suffering and glories, to which the gift of the Holy Spirit is related in this present dispensation.

Accordingly, when the disciples were baptized with the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, they were not only endued with ministering power, but they also then entered into the experience of sonship. Then they knew, as they could not have known before, though the Book of Acts records but little of their inner life, that through the heaven-descended Spirit, the sons of God are forever united with the heaven-ascended, glorified Son of God. Whether they at first fully realized the fact or not, they were in him and he in them. Was Jesus begotten of the Spirit, so were they; was he not of the world as to origin and nature, neither were they. Was he loved of the Father, so were they, and with the same love; was he sanctified and sent into the world to bear witness to the truth, so likewise he sent them. Did he receive the Spirit as the seal of God to his Sonship, so were they sealed; was he anointed with power and light to serve, so they received the unction from him. Did he begin to serve when there came the attesting Spirit and confirming word of the Father, so they began to serve when the Spirit of the Son, the Witness, was sent forth into their hearts, crying, "Abba, Father." Was he, after service and suffering, received up in glory, so shall they obtain his glory when he comes again to receive them unto himself. Verily, "we are as he is in this world" (I John 4:17).

4. In the gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost all gifts for believers in Christ were contained, and were related to

them as sons of God, both individually and corporately as the church, the body of Christ. In kind, as can be seen on comparison, there was no difference in his gifts and acts before and after that day, but the new gift was now to dwell in the hearts of men as sons of God, and with more abundant life and varied manifestations of power and wisdom. But by the Spirit the one body was formed, and all gifts are due to his perpetual presence (I Cor. 12:14). John 7:37-39 is an example of the anticipative sayings of our Lord, not to be made good until he had died and risen again.

It is significant that after Pentecost only the words, "filled with the Spirit," are used. Nothing is said of an individual's receiving a new or fresh "baptism of the Spirit." It would imply that the baptism is one for the whole body until all the members are incorporated; one the outpouring, many the fillings; one fountain, many the hearts to drink, to have in turn a well of water springing up within them.

The disciples were indeed endued with power for service according to promise; on that factor especially their eyes and hearts had been fixed. That was the chief thing for them; but in the light of later Scriptures it is seen that the principal thing with God was not only to attest the glory of Jesus by the gift of the Spirit, but also in one Spirit to baptize into one body the children of God, who until then were looked upon as scattered abroad, as unincorporated members (I Cor. 12:13; John 11:52; Gal. 3:27, 28). And the gift, whether to the body or to the individual member, is once for all. As the Christian is once for all in Christ, so the Holy Spirit is once for all in the Christian; but the purpose of the presence of the Spirit is often but feebly understood by the believer, just as his knowledge of what it is to be in Christ is often most defective.

5. The Holy Spirit is given at once on the remission of sins to them that believe in Christ Jesus as their Saviour and Lord. It is, however, to be observed that as the Spirit acts according to the truth known or believed or obeyed, an interval unspiritual or unfruitful may come between the remission of sins and the marked manifestation of the Spirit, either in relation to holiness of life, or to power for service or to patience in trials. It certainly is the divine ideal of a holy life, that the presence of the Spirit should at

once be made manifest on the forgiveness of sins, and continue in increasing light and power to the end (Rom. 5:1-5). This steady progress unto the perfect day has been and is true of many, who from early childhood or from the day of conversion in the case of adults, were led continually by the Spirit and never came to one great crisis. With others it is not so, for it is the confession of a large number of men and women, afterward eminent for holiness, that their life previous to such crisis had been hardly worth the name of Christian. It was a definite act of dedication to the full will of God that explains the change.

Their experience may be set forth in this way. The full truth of the sonship and salvation of believers may not have been taught them when they first believed; the life may have begun under a yoke of legal bondage. The freedom of filial access may have been doubted, even though their hearts often burned because of the presence of the unknown Spirit. Thus, weary, ineffective years passed, attended with little growth in grace or fruitful service or patient resignation, until a point was reached in various ways, when at last through dedication of heart the Holy Spirit made himself manifest in the fulness of his love and power. That there is with God an interval between justification and the giving of the Spirit (an interval such as certain theories contend for), cannot be proved. The unsatisfactory experience of the ignorant or disobedient Christian may lead him to think he never had the Spirit.

There are, however, certain intervals recorded in the New Testament which should be considered. The one between the ascension and Pentecost was for a peculiar preparation through prayer and waiting on the Lord. That in the case of the converts on the Day of Pentecost was doubtless for the confirmation of the apostolic authority; that of the Samaritans when Philip preached may be accounted for by remembering the religious feud between Jew and Samaritan which now must be settled for all time, and the unity of the church established. In regard to Paul, it is evident from the narrative that he knew not the full import of the appearing of Jesus until Ananias came (Acts 9:10-19). But the case of Cornelius proves that no interval at all need exist, for the moment Peter spoke this word, received by faith by Cornelius.

and those present, the Holy Spirit who knew their hearts fell on them. Neither does the remaining instance of the twelve disciples of John the Baptist at Ephesus, prove that such an interval is necessary today; for they had not even heard that Jesus had come, and that redemption had been accomplished, and the Spirit given. But as soon as remission of sins in the name of Jesus was preached to them, they believed, were baptized, and through prayer and the laying on of hands, received the Holy Spirit (Acts 19:1-6). The question Paul addressed to them has been most strangely applied in these days to Christians, whereas it was pertinent to these disciples of John only. To address it to Christians now is to deny a finished redemption, the sonship of believers, and the once-for-all out-pouring of the Holy Spirit.

6. The conditions of the manifestation of the presence and power of the Spirit are the same, at conversion or at any later, deeper experience of the believer, whether in relation to fuller knowledge of Christ, or to more effective service, or to more patient endurance of trials, or to growth in likeness to Christ. The experience in each case is run in the same mold: each word or fact of Christ must be received in the same attitude and condition of mind as the first, when he was seen as the bearer of our sins, that is, by faith alone. Negatively, it may be said that the conditions are confessed weakness and inability to help oneself, then a willingness to look to God alone for help.

The Scriptures do not teach, as implied or expressed in certain theories, that there is an interval between the remission of sins and the sealing of the Spirit, and that justified believers may die during such interval having never been sealed, and so never having been in Christ, and never having been attested sons of God. Such belief contradicts the very grace of God and implies that sonship depends upon the gift of the Spirit, and not upon redemption and the remission of sins (Gal. 4:5). It also follows that such justified ones devoid of the Spirit are not Christ's (Rom. 8:9; I Cor. 12:3). As to the proof of the presence of the Spirit, whatever emotions may attend the discoveries of the love and power of God in the case of some, they are not to be the tests and measures for all. Conversions are not alike in all, neither are the manifestations of the Spirit. More than all, the proof is

seen in growth in holiness, in self-denial for Christ's sake, in the manifold graces, and abiding fruit of the Spirit.

Positively, the requirements or inseparable accompaniments of the manifestation of the indwelling Spirit, whether for holy living or faithful service, must be drawn from the example of our Lord Jesus Christ. And they are prayer, obedience, faith, and above all a desire and purpose to glorify Christ. All, indeed, may be summed up in one condition and that is, to let God have his own will and way with us. If Christ is truly the wisdom of God unto salvation, the Holy Spirit alone can demonstrate it unto the minds and hearts of men; and he has no mission in the world separable from Christ and his work of redemption. The outer work of Christ and the inner work of the Spirit go together. The work for us by Christ is through the blood, the work in us by the Spirit is through the truth. The latter rests upon the former; and without the Spirit, substitutes for the Spirit and his work will be accompanied by substitutes for Christ and his work. The importance, therefore, of the presence and work of the Holy Spirit should be estimated according to that far-reaching word of Christ, "he shall glorify me" (John 16:13-15).

7. In conclusion, the sum of all his mission is to perfect in saints the good work he began, and he molds it all according to this reality of a high and holy sonship. He establishes the saints in and for Christ (II Cor. 1:21). According to this reality their life partakes of thoughts and desires, hopes and objects, spiritual and heavenly. Born of God, knowing whence they came and whither they are going, they live in a world not realized by flesh and blood. Their life is hid with Christ in God; their work of faith is wrought out in the unseen abode of the Spirit; their labor of love is prompted by a loyal obedience to their Lord, who is absent in a far country to which both he and they belong. Their sufferings are not their own but his, who from heaven could ask, "Why persecutest thou me?" Their worship is of the Father in spirit and in truth before the mercy-seat; their peace is the peace of God, which cannot be disturbed by any fear which eternal ages may disclose. Their joy is joy in the Lord, whose spring is in God and ever deepens in its perpetual flow; their hope is the coming of the Son of God from heaven and the vision of the King

in his beauty amidst the unspeakable splendors of his Father's house. And all through the way, thorn and flower, by which they are journeying to the heavenly country, it is the good Spirit who is leading them.

29

Christianity No Fable

By Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, M.A., D.D.

Kilmarnock, Scotland

Edited by Arnold D. Ehlert, Th.D.

I. ITS SUPREME EXCELLENCE

The first mark of the truthfulness of Christianity is to be found in its supreme excellence as a religious system. The unapproachable beauty and resistless charm of its conception, and the unique character of the means by which it seeks to carry out its aims, are not reconcilable with the notion of fable.

If, however, notwithstanding, Christianity is a fable, then it is the divinest fable ever clothed in human speech. Nothing like it can be found in the literature of the world. Paul only spoke the unvarnished truth when he declared that eye had not seen nor ear heard, neither had the mind of man conceived the things which God had revealed to men in the Gospel.

Not of Human Origin

1. The very conception of the Gospel as a scheme for rescuing a lost world from the guilt and power of sin, for transforming men into servants of righteousness, followers of Christ, and children of God, each one resembling himself and partaking of his nature, and for eventually lifting them up into a state of holy and blessed immortality like that in which he himself dwells — that conception never took its rise in the brains of a human fable-monger and least of all in that of a crafty priest or political deceiver — no, not even in that of the best and most brilliantly endowed thinker, poet, prophet or philosopher that ever lived. Men do not write novels and compose fiction in order to redeem their fellows from guilt and sin, to comfort and support them in death, and to prepare them for immortality. Even those who regard Christianity as being based on delusions and deceptions do not assert that the object of

its instructors was anything so lofty and spiritual, but rather that its fabricators sought thereby to enrich themselves by imposing on their credulous fellows, blinding them to the truth by setting before them fictions as if they were facts, frightening them with ghostly terrors and so securing a hold upon their services or their means. One of the claims of German speculation was that Christianity was manufactured in Rome in the time of Trajan, i.e., about the beginning of the second century, in order to help on a great liberation movement amongst the Jewish slave proletariat against their tyrannical masters, and that in fact it was an imaginary compound of Roman Socialism, Greek Philosophy and Jewish Messiahism. Neither of these, however, is the account furnished by Christianity itself in its accredited documents, of its aim, which, as already stated, is to deliver men from sin and death. The very grandeur of this aim proves that Christianity has not emanated from the mind of man, but must have proceeded from the heart of God. And it may be safely contended that Infinite Wisdom and Love makes no use of fables and deceptions, legends and fictions to further its purposes and realize its aims.

2. If, in addition, the details of the Christian scheme be considered, that is to say, the particular means by which it proposes to effect its aim, it will further appear that the idea of fiction and fable must be laid aside and that of reality and truth set in its place. It will not be seriously questioned that the details of the Christian scheme are substantially and briefly these: (1) that God in infinite love and out of pure grace, from eternity purposed to provide salvation for the fallen race of man; (2) that in order to carry out that purpose he sent his own Son, only begotten and well-beloved, the brightness of his glory and the express image of his Person, into this world in the likeness of sinful flesh, to die for men's sins, thereby rendering satisfaction for the same, and to rise again from the dead, thereby showing that God had accepted the sacrifice and could on the ground of it be just and the justifier of the ungodly as well as bringing life and immortality to light; and (3) that on the ground of this atoning work salvation is offered to all on the sole condition of faith. This being so, can any one for a moment believe that forgers and fable-mongers would

or could have invented so divine a tale? All experience certifies the contrary.

Whensoever men have attempted to construct schemes of salvation, they have not sought the origin of these schemes in God but in themselves. Human schemes have always been plans by which men might be able to save themselves, with such salvation as they have supposed themselves to need — not always a salvation from sin and death; more frequently a salvation from material poverty, bodily discomfort, mental ignorance and generally temporal needs. Nor have they ever dreamt of a salvation that should come to them through the mediation of another, and certainly not of God himself in the Person of his Son; but always of a salvation through their own efforts. Never of a salvation by grace through faith and therefore free; but always of a salvation by works and through merit and therefore as a debt — a salvation by outward forms and magical rites, or by education and culture.

Who Invented It?

3. Then, it may be added: If the Christian scheme is a fable, who invented the idea of an Incarnation? For to Jewish minds at any rate such an idea was foreign, being forbidden by their strong monotheism. Who put together the picture of Jesus as it appears in the Gospels? Who conceived the notion of making it that of a sinless man, and doing it so successfully that all subsequent generations of beholders, with a few exceptions at most, have regarded him as sinless? Yet a sinless man had never been seen before nor has ever been beheld since his appearance. Who supplied this Jesus with the superhuman power that performed works only possible to God and with the superhuman wisdom that fell from his lips, if such wisdom was never spoken but only imagined? It is universally allowed that the power and wisdom of Jesus have never been surpassed or even equalled. Whose was the daring genius that struck out the notion not merely of making atonement for sin, but of doing this by Christ's giving his life a ransom for many and demonstrating its reality through his rising from the dead? These conceptions were so incredible to his followers at the first and have been so unacceptable to natural man since, that it is hard to believe any fable-monger would have selected them for his work, even though they had occurred to him.

And who suggested the doctrine of a twofold resurrection at the end of time? — a doctrine to which unaided human science or philosophy has never been able to attain.

The impartial reasoner must perceive that in all these themes we are dealing not with purely human thoughts but with thoughts that are divine, and that it is idle to talk of them as fabulous or untrue. "God is not a man that he should lie." He is neither a tyrant that he should seek to oppress men, nor a false priest that he should want to cheat men, nor a novel writer that he should study to amuse men, but a Father whose dearest interest is to save men, who is Light and in him is no darkness at all, and whose words are like himself, the same yesterday, today and forever.

II. ITS PERFECT ADAPTATION

The second mark of truthfulness in the Christian scheme is its perfect adaptation to the end for which it was designed.

1. Assuming for the moment that the Christian system is entirely a product of the human mind, or a pure fabrication, the question to be considered is, whether it is at all likely that it would perfectly answer the end for which it was intended. If that end was to deceive men in order to enslave and degrade them, then its concocters have signally outwitted themselves; for no sooner does a man accept Christianity, than he finds that if he is deceived thereby, it is a blessed deception which makes it impossible to keep him in subjection or degradation, since it illuminates his understanding, purifies his heart, cleanses his imagination, quickens his conscience, strengthens his will and ennobles his whole nature. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," said Christ. On the other hand, if its end was to do this very thing, then undoubtedly its end has been reached; but the mere fact that it has been reached, shows that the scheme has not proceeded from the human mind as a work of fiction, but from the heart of God as a Scripture of truth.

2. If there be one thing more characteristic of man's works than another, it is imperfection. Magnificent as some of man's inventions have been, few of them are absolutely free from defects, and those that are the freest have been brought to their present state of excellence only by slow and short stages and after repeated

modifications and improvements — witness the printing press, the steam engine, telegraphy, electrical power and lighting, musical instruments, airplanes, etc. And what is more, however perfect any human invention may appear to be at the present moment, there is no guarantee that it will not be in time superseded by something more adapted to the end it has in view.

The case, however, is different with God's works which like himself, are all perfect; and if it shall turn out on examination that the Christian system is perfectly adapted to the end it has in view, viz., salvation, and has never needed to be changed, modified or improved, then the inference will be unavoidable that it is God's work and not man's and as a consequence not a fiction but a fact, not fable but truth.

I am aware that at the present moment there are those who declare that Christianity is played out, that it has served its day, that it has lost its hold on men's minds, and will require to give place to some other panacea for the ills of life. But for the most part that is the cry of those who have not themselves tried Christianity and hardly understand what it means. And in any case no effective substitute for Christianity has ever been put forward by its opponents or critics. Nor has any attempt to modify or improve Christianity as a system of religious doctrine ever been successful. Perhaps one of the most strenuous efforts in this direction has been that of so-called liberal (alias rationalistic) theology which seeks to divest Christianity of all its supernatural elements, and in particular of its divine-human Jesus by reducing him to the dimensions of an ordinary man — in which case it is obvious, the whole superstructure of Christianity would fall to the ground. Yet a contributor to the *Hibbert Journal* (Jan. 1910), who himself does not accept orthodox Christianity, writes of "The Collapse of Liberal Christianity," and frankly confesses that "the simple Jesus of liberal Christianity cannot be found," which amounts to an admission that the picture of Jesus in the Gospels as a Divine Man, a supernatural Christ, is no fiction but a sublime truth.

3. A detailed examination of the Christian scheme shows that means better fitted to secure its ends could not have been devised.

a. It will not be denied that part of the aim of Christianity is to restore mankind in general and individuals in particular to the favor and fellowship of God, out of which they have been cast by sin. Whether the Bible is right in its explanation of the origin of sin, need not now be argued. Common observation as well as individual conscience testifies to the fact of sin; and the disastrous condition of the race induced by sin Christianity proposes to remedy — not by telling men that sin is only a figment of the imagination (which men know better than believe); or, if a reality, so trifling a matter that God will overlook it (which men in their best moments doubt); and certainly not by asking men to save themselves (which they soon discover they cannot do); but by first setting forth sin in all its moral loathsomeness and legal guiltiness, and then announcing that God himself had provided a lamb for a burnt-offering, even his own Son, upon whom he has laid the iniquity of us all, and that now he is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses.

b. A second thing proposed by Christianity is to make men holy, to free them from the love and practice of sin to conform them in the love and practice of truth and righteousness; and this it seeks to do by giving man a new heart and a right spirit, by changing his nature, implanting in it holy principles and putting it under the government of the divine and eternal spirit.

That the means are adequate has been proved by the experience of the past nineteen centuries, in which millions of human souls have been translated out of darkness into light and turned from the service of Satan to the service of the Living God. And what is more, other methods have been tried without effecting any permanent transformation of either hearts or lives. Magical incantations, meaningless mummeries, laborious ceremonies, painful penances, legislations, education, philanthropy, have in turn been resorted to, but in vain. Never once has the Gospel method been fairly tried and proved inefficient.

c. A third thing Christianity engages to do, is to confer on those who accept it a blessed immortality — to support them when they come to die, to cheer them with the prospect of a happy existence while their bodies are in the grave, to bring those bodies forth again, and in the end to bestow on their whole personality a

glorious unending life beneath a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. And Christianity does this by first securing its adherents a title to eternal life through the obedience unto death of Christ, next by making them meet for the inheritance through the indwelling and operation of Christ's Spirit, then by opening for them the gates of immortality through Christ's resurrection, and finally by Christ's coming for them at the end of the age.

Now can anything more complete be thought of as a scheme of salvation? Is there any part of it that is not exactly fitted to its place and suited to its end? So far is this from being the case that not a single pin can be removed from the building without bringing down the whole superstructure. Abstract from Christianity the Incarnation, or the Atonement, or the Resurrection, or the Exaltation, or the Future Coming, and its framework is shattered. Take away pardon or purity or peace or sonship or heaven, and its value as a system of religion is gone. But these are not assertions that will hold good of fables and fictions, myths and legends, which might all be tampered with, taken from or added to, without endangering their worth. Hence, it is fair to argue, that a scheme so admirably adjusted in all its parts, so complete in its provisions and so exquisitely adapted to its design, could only have emanated from the mind of him who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working, who is the true God and the Eternal Life.

III. ITS CONSPICUOUS SUCCESS

A third mark of truthfulness in the Christian system is its conspicuous success in effecting the end for which it was designed.

Had Christianity been a baseless imagination, or a superstitious legend, is there reason to suppose either that it would have lived so long or that it would have achieved the wonders it has done during the past nineteen centuries — either upon individuals or upon the world at large? It is true that mere length of time in which a religion has prevailed when considered by itself, is no sufficient guarantee of the truth of that religion, else Buddhism would possess a higher certificate of truthfulness than Christianity; but when viewed in connection with the beneficial results in elevating mankind, both individually and collectively, which have followed from a religion, the length of time during which it has continued

is no small testimony to its truth. Still the practical effects of a religion upon individuals and upon the world at large, as has been said, form an argument in its favor which cannot easily be set aside.

1. As to the individual. Had the facts upon which Christianity is based been purely fictitious, had the story of the Incarnation, Death and Resurrection of Jesus been only a legend, and had the promise of pardon, purity and peace, of everlasting life and glory which Christianity holds out to men been a deception instead of a verity, does any one imagine it would have effected the transformations it has wrought on individual hearts and lives? I remember that the first lie told by the devil in Eden plunged the whole race of mankind into spiritual death. I have yet to learn that a lie hatched by even good people can save men from perdition and lift them to heaven, can bless them with inward happiness and assure them of divine favor, can comfort them in sorrow, strengthen them in weakness, sustain them in death and fit them for eternity. And yet that is what Christianity can do — has done in past ages to millions who have tried it, and is doing to-day to thousands who are trying it. It will take more than has been said by critics and scoffers to persuade me that these things have been done by a fable. I have heard of fables and fictions, legends and superstitions amusing men and women, diverting them when wearied, occupying them when idle, taking their thoughts off serious matters and even helping them to shut their eyes against death's approach; I never heard of their bringing souls to God, assuring them of his favor, cleansing them from sin, blessing them with peace, preparing them for eternity. But these again are what Christianity can do and does; and so I reason it is not a fable, but a fact, not a legend but a history, not an imaginary tale, but a solid truth.

2. And when to this I add what it has done on the broad theatre of the world, my faith in its truth is confirmed. Nineteen centuries ago Christianity started out on its conquering career. It had neither wealth nor power, nor learning, nor social influence, nor imperial patronage upon its side. It was despised by the great ones of the earth as a superstition. It was looked upon by Jew and Gentile as subversive of religion and morals. Its adherents were collected from the dregs of the population, from the poor and the

ignorant (at least in the world's estimation) ; and its apostles were a humble band, mostly of fishermen — though they soon had their ranks enlarged by the accession of one (Paul) whose mental force and religious earnestness were worth to Christianity whole battalions of common disciples or of average preachers. But what was one, even though he was an intellectual and spiritual giant, to the mighty task set before it of conquering the world and making all nations obedient to the Faith? Yet that task was immediately taken in hand and with what success the annals of the past centuries declare.

In the first century, which may be called the Apostolic Age, it practically defeated Judaism, by establishing itself as an organized religion, not in Palestine alone, but in Asia Minor, and in some of the chief cities of Europe. To this it was no doubt helped by the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 by the armies of Titus; but the undermining of Judaism was being gradually brought about by the spread of the Christian Faith.

In the next two centuries, which may be called the Age of the Fathers, it overcame paganism, substituting in wide circles the worship of Jesus for the worship of heathen divinities and of the Roman Emperor. Not without passing through fierce tribulation in the long succession of persecutions with which it was assailed, did it achieve the victory, but in its experience was repeated the experience of Israel in Egypt — “the more it was afflicted the more it multiplied and grew” so that by the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century it had within its pale about a fifth of the Roman Empire.

From that time on Christianity applied itself to the task of making nominal Christians into real ones; and but for the mercy of God at the Reformation it might have been defeated. But God's Spirit brooded upon the moral and spiritual waste as erst he did upon the material in the beginning, and God's Word said — “Let there be light!” and there was light. Luther in Germany, Calvin in Geneva, and Knox in Scotland, with others in different parts arose as champions of the truth and recalled men's thoughts to the simplicities and certainties of the Gospel; and a great awakening overspread the nominally Christian world.

Thereafter Christianity took a forward step among the nations; and is now doing for the world what no other religion has done or can do — neither Buddhism nor Confucianism, nor Mohammedanism — what no modern substitute for Christianity can do — whether materialism, or agnosticism, or spiritism or socialism; and just because of this we may rest assured that Christianity is no cunningly devised fable but a divinely revealed truth — that it alone contains hope for the world, as a whole, and for generation after generation as it passes and that the day will yet come when it will fill the globe.

In short, when one remembers that Christianity has built up the Christian church and that the Christian church has been the most powerful factor in creating modern civilization, it becomes an impossibility to credit the allegation or even to harbor the suspicion, that it is founded on a lie. By its fruits it may be tested. Notwithstanding the imperfections that adhere to the Christian church so far as it is a human institution, few will deny that its existence in the world has been productive of preponderantly good results, and on that certificate alone it may be claimed that Christianity is no "cunningly devised fable" but a sure revelation of God's glorious redemptive purpose for sinful men.

105565
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.